

SHAMS-UL-ULEMA DASTUR DR. DARAB PESHOTAN SANJANA,

B.A., PH.D., J.P.

THE
COLLECTED WORKS
OF THE LATE
DASTUR DARAB PESHOTAN SANJANA
B.A., Ph.D., J.P.
PRINCIPAL,
STR JAMSHEDJI JIJIBHOY ZARATHUSHTI MADRESSA,
BOMBAY.

BRITISH INDIA PRESS,
BOMBAY.
1932.



PRINTED BY HENRY L. PHILLIPS, SUPERINTENDENT, BRITISH INDIA PRESS, AND PUBLISHED BY
RATANBAI CAWASJI BADSHAW AT HALCYON LODGE VATCHGANDHY ROAD, NEW GAMDEVI, BOMBAY.



WORKS INCLUDED :

- I. ZARATHUSHTRA IN THE GATHAS.**
- II. VIEWS OF CLASSICAL WRITERS REGARDING ZOROASTER AND HIS DOCTRINES.**
- III. EASTERN IRANIAN CIVILIZATION IN AVESTA TIMES.**
- IV. GUSHTASP AND ZOROASTER.**
- V. IRANIAN ART.**
- VI. THE IRANIAN ALPHABETS.**
- VII. THE ALLEGED PRACTICE OF CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES IN ANCIENT IRAN.**
- VIII. SYAVAKHSH AND SUDABEH.**
- IX. POSITION OF ZOROASTRIAN WOMEN IN REMOTE ANTIQUITY.**

CONTENTS.

	Page.
PREFACE	I-VI
ZARATHUSHTRA IN THE GATHAS	1-38
General Remarks	1
I.—The Authorship of the Avesta	6
II.—The Religious and Social Reforms of Zarathushtra	11
III.—Zarathushtra's Message	17
IV.—The Theology of the Gathas	23
V.—Zoroastrianism is not a dualistic System	30
VIEWS OF CLASSICAL WRITERS REGARDING ZOROASTER AND HIS DOCTRINES	39-80
EASTERN IRANIAN CIVILIZATION IN AVESTA TIMES	81-333
DR. GEIGER'S Introduction	81
I.—Ethnography of the Avesta people	110-141
1. The Arians and their Extensions	110
2. The Adversaries of the Avesta People	116
3. Character of the Adversaries of the Avesta People	126
4. Names of Nations in the Avesta	130
II.—PRIVATE LIFE	142-189
5. Physical Characteristics of Men and Women	142
6. Dwelling, Clothing and Food	144
7. Birth, Education and Admission into the Community	144
8. Love and Marriage	149
9. Prayers and Household Customs	155
10. Death and Disposal of the Body	165
11. Immortality and Eschatology	173
12. The Cult of the Manes	184
III.—MENTAL AND MORAL CULTURE	190-221
13. Man in Relation to his Body and Soul	190
14. The World	194
15. Chronology and Calender	204
16. Religion and Superstition	214
17. Morality	218
IV.—ECONOMICAL LIFE	222-278
18. Cattle-Breeding	222
19. Agriculture	242
20. Manufactures	252
21. Medicine and Commerce	255

CONTENTS.—*Contd.*

	Page.
22. The Settlements of the Avesta People	261
V.—STATE AND LAWS	279-307
23. Constitution	279
24. War and Military Concerns	289
25. Legal Rights	298
VI.—ORGANISATION OF PROFESSIONS	308-333
26. The Priesthood	308
27. Warriors, Peasants, Manufacturers and Slaves	319
28. The Mutual Relations of the Several Orders	324
VII.—ON THE HOME AND AGE OF THE AVESTA	333
General Remarks	333
29. The Home of the Avesta	335
30. The Age of the Avesta	350
GUSHTASP AND ZOROASTER	386-423
IRANIAN ART	424-452
THE IRANIAN ALPHABETS.. .. .	453-461
THE ALLEGED PRACTICE OF CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES IN ANCIENT	
IRAN	462-499
SYAVAKHSH AND SUDABEH	500-505
POSITION OF ZOROASTRIAN WOMEN IN REMOTE ANTIQUITY.. .. .	506-524



PREFACE.

THIS edition of most of the important English works of the late Shams-ul-Ulema Dr. Dastur Darab Dastur Peshotanji Sanjana was taken in hand by him about the year 1927 and he was very anxious to get it published during his life time. But his publication of the final volume of the Pahlavi text of the *Dinkard* which was completed about the end of 1928, and the failing health of the great Dastur during the subsequent years considerably delayed the work of this volume. Meanwhile death took away the indefatigable author of these works from our midst, on the 5th August, 1931, and this book has now to appear as his posthumous work.

Of the works of the late learned Dastur included in this publication the first six consist of translation from the German of Drs. Geiger, Windischmann, and Spiegel, from different texts enriched with foot-notes by the translator wherever he found it necessary to differ from the original or wherever he could place before his reader some reference that had escaped the notice of the learned savants from the West.

Dr. Wilhelm Geiger was born at Nurnberg, Bavaria, on the 21st of July, 1856, and at the age of 17 he became a member of the University of Erlangen where during several years he attended the lectures and other instructions of the then famous Professor Friderich von Spiegel with whom he had the good fortune to form a close acquaintance and to whom he was deeply indebted for his initiation into Sanskrit, Avesta, Pahlavi and Persian studies. He next visited the Universities of Bonn and Berlin, where too he continued the studies into the Avesta literature. 'The antiquity of the Avesta,' declared Dr. Geiger in one of his letters, 'its language and contents, the purity and sublimity of its religious and moral ideas, excited in me the greatest love and interest for Iranian research.' By his first edition and translation of the Vendidad, Chapter I. (*Die Pehleviversion des ersten Capitels des Vendidād herausgegeben, nebst dem Versuch einer ersten Uebersetzung und Erklärung*, Erlangen, 1877) he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philology in 1877 and was appointed in the same year *Privatdocent* (lecturer) of Oriental languages in the University of Erlangen. In the year 1878 he published the Pazand, Old-Bactrian and Sanskrit texts of 'Aogemadaēchā', and next year he published his complete German 'Manual of the Avesta Language, containing grammar, selections for reading and glossary'. Since the autumn of 1881 he has resided at Neustadt as a professor in the Gymnasium. The most important contribution of Dr. Geiger to Avesta studies is his voluminous work containing a comprehensive history of the 'Civilization of the Eastern Iranians' (*Ostirānische Kultur im Alterthum, mit einer Uebersichts-Karte von Ostirān*, Erlangen, 1882). A translation in English of this work beginning with

Chapter III was prepared by the late Dastur Darab and published in two volumes in 1885-1886, and is included in pp. 81-333 of this work.

In 1884, Dr. Geiger contributed an excellent essay to the 'Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy on 'the Fatherland and Age of the Avesta and its Civilization,' (*Ueber Vaterland und Zeitalter des Avesta und seiner Kultur*, 1884), in which he goes on to prove, courteously refuting the ideas or arguments of his predecessors, that the civilization of the Avesta people points to Eastern Iran and belongs to a period long before the existence of the Median and Persian monarchies. A translation of this essay was added by Dastur Darab to his translation of the earlier text and is included here on pp. 333-385.

Dr. Geiger's essay on 'Zarathushtra in the Gathas' (*Zarathushtra in den Gāthās*) was first printed by Dastur Darab with an English translation in 1897. Herein Dr. Geiger is able to draw from his close researches in the Avesta literature the following inferences :—(1) The Iranians had in very olden time, and without any foreign influence, independently acquired through the Zoroastrian Reform, the possession of a monotheistic religion, and its founders had attained to that stage in ethics to which only the best parts of the Old Testament rise. (2) The Iranians display an inclination towards that depth of moral intuition which is perceptible in Christianity ; at a very early period the Gāthās knew the ethical triad of the righteous thought, the righteous word, and the righteous deed.

In the publication of the above essay by Dr. Geiger, Dastur Darab also included the translation in English of the German essay of Dr. F. Windischmann, *Stellen der Alten über Zoroastrisches*, "References in Ancient writings to Zoroaster and his Doctrines." It is highly interesting, giving as it does a comprehensive collection of the foreign views of classical authors regarding the Persian Zoroaster and his Revelation. These two last essays are embodied in this book on pp. 1-80.

Next we come to three interesting chapters from the German publication, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, of Dr. F. von. Spiegel, the well known Oriental Scholar under whom Dr. Geiger received his early initiation in the Iranian languages. Dr. Spiegel was born on the 11th July, 1820, at Kitzingen on the Maine (near Würzburg), and while still at his grammar school became interested in the study of Oriental languages. In 1839, he went to the University of Erlangen and was there one of the last pupils of the celebrated German poet Friedrich Rückert under whose direction he studied Sanskrit, Arabic and Neo-Persian. The epic of Firdusi remained for the rest of his life one of the favourite texts for the great Orientalist. From Erlangen Spiegel went to Leipzick and then to Bonn, where under Lassen he began his researches into Pali, the holy language of the Southern Buddhistic religion. In 1842 he was created a doctor of the philosophical faculty of the University of Jena. The same year he went to Copenhagen, and then to Paris, London

and Oxford to study the Zend and Pahlavi MSS. in the libraries there. On his return to Germany in 1847, he first went to Munich where he was greatly encouraged and helped in his studies by the Orientalists, Joseph Muller and Friedrich Windischmann. In 1849 he returned to his old University of Erlangen as an extraordinary professor and in 1853 he was nominated professor in *ordinary*. During his professorship at Erlangen he delivered a number of lectures and discourses on varied subjects showing his thorough researches into Oriental languages, and several students who heard his lectures became later on great Iranists themselves. Of these mention can be here made of Drs. Geiger and Bartholomae, in Europe and the late Mr. K. R. Cama, who on his return to India was the pioneer in advancing Oriental studies in Bombay and after whom is named the Oriental Institute of Bombay. During the period of his academical career Spiegel published numerous articles and essays in the records of the Bavarian Academy and in various other periodicals. Several of these essays were reprinted in a collection under the title, *Erân, das Land zwischen dem Indus und Tigris*, 1863. He published a grammar of *Old Bactrian* in 1867. Then appeared his monumental work *Erânische Alterthumskunde* in three volumes from 1871 to 1878, three interesting chapters of which were translated by Dastur Darab into English, (pp. 386-461). The question of the relations between the Persians and the Indians was dealt with by Spiegel in his book *The Arian Period and its conditions*. In his last publication *Über den Zoroastrismus*, 1903 he again sums up his earlier findings that 'the Old Persian religion had nothing to do with India.' Spiegel died on the 15th December, 1905. In his translation of the Avesta, 1863, published in three volumes Spiegel adhered strictly to the traditional Pahlavi translations. At first he met with violent opposition from European scholars in thus interpreting the Avesta with the help of the Pahlavi translations, but as time went on and Pahlavi studies advanced through the patient labours of Dr. West, the value of the Pahlavi translations was more and more recognized and Spiegel had the satisfaction to know that his method of interpretation was accepted as the correct one.

In the course of their studies of the Avesta and Pahlavi texts, and the allusions in some classical writers about the life and religion of the ancient Iranians the European Orientalists were surprised to discover the statement that next-of-kin marriages were not only allowed but extolled among the ancient Iranians. This allegation was taken up by the late Dastur Darab and in his very able discourse on the *Alleged Practice of Consanguineous Marriages in Ancient Iran*, he has discussed and refuted all the passages where the said practice is supposed to be referred to. The short article on *Syavakhsh and Sudabeh* is a supplement to the same question and after a study of these very exhaustive essays on the subject there is no doubt left that the alleged practice far from being common and held in esteem was very rarely practised and even then held in great abhorrence, in ancient Irân.

Lastly we come to a very interesting paper on the *Position of Zoroastrian Women in Remote Antiquity* which was first read and published by the learned Dastur in 1892. While dealing with his subject the author adhered to the earliest fragments of the Avesta literature and has collected almost all the references from the sacred writings in ancient Irân. On perusing the pages the reader learns of the "extent to which Zoroastrian men had, in very olden times, cherished respect for women, and the position they assigned to them in social, moral and religious relations—a position if not nobler, at least as noble, as that accorded to them by the most civilized nations known in the history of the world."

Before concluding it will not be out of place here to give a brief sketch of the life and career of the late Dastur Darab Peshotan Sanjana, the learned author of the works herein collected. Dastur Darab was the second son of the late Shams-ul-Ulema Dastur Peshotanji B. Sanjana who was a great Pahlavi scholar himself, renowned in both India and Europe for his early efforts in spreading a knowledge of Pahlavi by publishing books with translations into Gujarati and English. After his death in 1898 a memorial volume was published in his honour to which contributions were sent by eminent European Iranists of the time.

Dastur Darab was born on the 18th November 1857, in Bombay, in a family which for generations had made its name for study of the sacred Parsi Zoroastrian books. He received his school education in the Elphinstone and Proprietary High Schools in Bombay, and then joined the Elphinstone College where he graduated in the year 1880. He continued his studies in Avesta and Pahlavi at the Sir Jamshedji Jijibhoy Zartoshti Madressa in Bombay under the able direction of his illustrious father, and through his proficiency in studies he was able to win a gold medal and was then appointed a Fellow at the Madressa. During his Fellowship he studied German, French and Sanskrit languages which were so useful to him in his later work. Two years later the University of Bombay also elected him a Fellow and he was appointed an Examiner in Persian and then in Avesta and Pahlavi at the University Examinations from that date almost till the end of his life.

His literary activities began in the year 1882 when he contributed to the columns of the *Bombay Gazette* (November 3, 1882), his article on the *Avesta Doctrine regarding Man in relation to his Body and Soul*. In 1885 followed his volumes of the *Civilization of the Eastern Irânians in Ancient Times*, containing as already noted translation from the German works of Drs. Geiger and Spiegel. Dastur Darab's long paper on the *Alleged Practice of Consanguineous Marriages in Ancient Irân*, appearing in 1888 early showed the industry and intimate mastery of the Avesta and Pahlavi texts which he could exhibit in a work taken in hand by him. Similar zeal is also shown in his next original paper regarding the *Position of Zoroastrian Women in Remote Antiquity* (1892).

Now Dastur Darab took up several Pahlavi texts for publication and elucidation. He first published a photozincograph facsimile of a MS. of the *Nirangistân* with an introduction and collations with another Iranian MS. 1894, having read before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society a paper on the *Extant Pahlavi Codices of the Nirangistân* the same year. Next year appeared his text of the Pahlavi *Dînâ î Maînû î Khrat* or the Religious Decisions of the Spirit of Wisdom, and the Pahlavi Version of the Avesta Vendidâd, the *Zend î Jvîr Shêdâ Dâd*, containing the text with an introduction, critical and philological notes and Appendices on the History of Avesta Literature. Now followed the very interesting historical Pahlavi text of the *Kârnâmak î Artakshâr î Pâpakân*, 1896, containing the oldest record of the reign of Ardeshir Bâbakan, the great founder of the Sâssânian Dynasty in Persia.

In 1897 appeared *Zarathushtra in the Gâthâs and the Classics* containing a translation from the German of Drs. Geiger and Windischmann, together with appendices containing Tansar's Alleged letter to the King of Tabaristân, and Observations on Darmesteter's theory regarding the above letter and the Age of the Avesta.

But more than all the above works Dastur Darab's name will be ever remembered by students of the Pahlavi language for his long and patient work in the publication of the *Dînkard* Vols. X. to XIX. His connection with the publication of this voluminous Pahlavi text dated from the year 1888 when he collaborated with his learned father Dastur Peshotanji in preparing the English translation of Volume V. from the Gujarati translation of his father. After his father's death in 1898, he published Vol. IX. posthumously in 1900. Volume X. of the *Dînkard* edited wholly by Dastur Darab appeared in 1907. The twenty-one years that followed were almost exclusively devoted by the late Dastur Darab in plodding patiently through the difficult text of a work like the *Dînkard* rendered still more laborious on account of the character of the MSS. available for the purpose. It was, as it was with his father, a work of his life. His failing health made him fear some times that the great task would remain unfinished. But he had the satisfaction of seeing the last volume containing the concluding portion of the text published by the year 1928, thus leaving for Pahlavi students a monumental work extending over a period of fifty-four years from 1874 when the first Volume was published by Dastur Peshotanji.

Such a devotion to a life of study and scholarship did not long remain unhonoured and unrewarded. He was elected a Justice of the Peace in 1888, and he was enrolled a member of several learned societies including the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland of which he was elected a member in 1892. In 1894 he was appointed the Naib-Dastur of the Hormasji Wadia Fire Temple in Bombay and on the death of his father in 1898 he succeeded

him as the Dastur or the High Priest of the Parsis in Bombay. In the same year he was also appointed the Principal of the Sir Jamshedji Jijibhoy Zartoshti Madressa a post which he held till the day of his death, there endeavouring to infuse in the students of the Madressa great zeal for the study of the ancient Iranian languages to which he had devoted his life. In 1899 the Government of India honoured him by conferring upon him the title of Shams-ul-Ulema in recognition of his learning.

Dastur Darab's work and scholarship were appreciated not only in India but he was held in high esteem by the great Iranists of the West, both in Europe and America. When a volume in his honour was published in 1925 a number of savants in Europe and America contributed papers to it as a token of their veneration for his long and eminent services to the cause of Avesta and Pahlavi studies. Lastly the University of Marburg conferred upon him the honorary degree of Ph.D.

Besides his literary activities the Dastur took an active part in all matters affecting the Parsi community and he was always ready to give benefit of his deep study of the Zoroastrian religion to members of his community. Such a useful and active life came to a close on the 5th August, 1931, at the age of 73.

Thus ended the career of Dastur Darab after years of patient toil with Pahlavi MSS. and texts which required careful decipherment and elucidation, and the works he left behind are in themselves sufficient testimony to his indefatigable energy and unbounded enthusiasm for the advancement of Pahlavi studies. For generations to come these works will continue to be a monument to his name as a great Pahlavi scholar and a great Dastur.

BOMBAY, 15th April 1932.

J. C. TARAPORE.

ZARATHUSHTRA IN THE GATHAS.*

GENERAL REMARKS.

Every religion, wheresoever and whensoever it may have sprung up, has its history and its development. No religion appears of a sudden as something perfectly novel and unexpected. The eye of the historical investigator who seeks to prove and understand every event in the history of mankind according to causes and effects, will perceive that every new form of religion is preceded by a period of time which we may call the period of preparation. At such a period there appear certain phenomena in the intellectual, moral and economical life of the people which point to an imminent revolution of ideas. As these phenomena become more numerous and more powerful the desire for a reformation of the whole system of life will become more and more powerful and vigorous, until, one might say, with a certain natural necessity, the personage appears who will be able to give an expression to the wishes and hopes of all the people, and thus turn out to be the founder of a new doctrine. To the contemporary this doctrine may in sooth appear as something quite unexpected and unheard of ; because he cannot yet grasp the causes and effects of the events which he himself lives to behold. But the historical inquirer, who is capable of doing it, will trace the phenomena which prepare such an important event, and he will discover them everywhere and at all times, whether he turns his attention to the history of Christianity or Islamism, of Buddhism or Zoroastrianism.

As every religion has, however, its pre-history, so it has also its development. Not only do the natural religions of the wild Africans, Americans, and Australians contain a continuous transformation and variation, such is also the case, although in a smaller measure, with the so-called book-religions, *i. e.*, with the religions which depend upon sacred documents as compendia of their doctrines, as the rule and standard for the life of their adherents.¹ Even in the Jewish religion, so far as it is known to us in the Old Testament, we discover traces of development and decay. It has not entered on its existence as something finished and complete from the beginning ; but it has also undergone decay as well as development and improvement.

Now the investigator, who has made the contents and the history of any of the religious systems the theme of his discourse, will have to face the task of never losing sight of the idea of development and of tracing the course of this development. He will have to give himself the trouble of establishing, if possible, the original or primitive form of the religion, and of distinguishing the oldest form from what has been added to it in the course of time, and from

* Translated from the German of Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Geiger, now in Berlin, Germany.

¹ Comp. Prof. Max-Müller's "Lectures on the Origin and Development of Religion," pp. 149-150,

what must indispensably have been added to it. I say "indispensably," because as the religion of a nation must be reckoned as one of its most important social advantages, so it will experience, like all other social endowments, certain changes in the course of centuries. The general social standard of the people becomes altered, their economical conditions are changed, even their dwellings may be transplanted; therewith also ideas and views, thoughts and learning, undergo their changes, and even what man preserves as his highest and holiest good, his religion, will adapt itself to such transformations. The substance, the nature, and the kernel of the thing remain the same, unless a people breaks entirely with customs and tradition, and endeavours to search out entirely new ways; but the old contents are embodied into new forms, and this must be so if religion is not to lose that power in the social life of the people by which it moves and always animates afresh the intellect and the heart. It is self-evident that it is only then possible to find out or establish the original substance of any religious doctrine, when literary materials are extant which either proceed from the founder of the doctrine itself or at least are traceable to his time, and which thereby bear the stamp of truth and authenticity.

If we make an attempt in the following pages to trace back to its oldest and most primitive form the Zoroastrian doctrine which, after a duration of certainly twenty-five centuries, and after an eventful history of battles and triumphs, persecutions and successes, is professed even now-a-days by about 100,000 persons, the question arises whether this is altogether still possible. Do we possess documents, the composition of which may be ascribed to the founder, or which had at least their origin in his time and perhaps belonged to the circle of his first adherents and friends? We can answer this question in the affirmative; for we are in fact still in the possession of such documents, and *such documents are the Gâthâs, i.e., the holy hymns, which constitute the oldest portion of the Avesta, the Religious Book of the Zoroastrians.*

It is here superfluous to characterize in detail the form and contents of the Gâthâs. They form, as is well known, a part of the *Yasna, i.e., of the holy manual which is prescribed for recitation at the sacrificial ceremonies.* However, they stand in no intimate connection with the *Yasna*; but they are inserted quite irregularly, and without coherence with the rest of the text, in that part of the *Yasna* where their recitation, corresponding to the ritual, has to be performed during the divine service. Consequently, the Gâthâs form for themselves an independent whole, just as the sacred law-book, the *Vendidad*, the chapters of which are in a quite analogous manner inserted between the different sections of the *Yasna* in the manuscripts of the so-called *Vendidad-Sâde*. From the rest of the *Avesta, viz., the Yasna, together with the Visperad, the Vendidad, and the Yashts,* the Gâthâs are already distinguished externally by the metrical form in which they are composed—which reminds us often of the metre of the hymns of the *Rig-veda*—as well as by their language which differs materially from the ordinary *Avesta* dialect.

The extent of the Gâthâs is unfortunately scanty. From my calculations the following figures are given which might not be without interest :-

1. Gâthâ *Ahunavairi*, 300 lines ; about 2,100 words. (*Yasna*, chaps. XXVIII-XXXIV).
2. Gâthâ *Ushtavairi*, 330 lines ; about 1,850 words. (*Yasna*, chaps. XLIII-XLVI.)
3. Gâthâ *Spentâ-mainyû*, 164 lines ; about 900 words. (*Yasna*, chaps. XLVII-L).
4. Gâthâ *Vohû-khshathra*, 66 lines ; about 450 words. (*Yasna*, chap. LI.)
5. Gâthâ *Vahishtô-ishti*, 36 lines ; about 260 words. (*Yasna*, chap. LIII.)

Hence these Gâthâs contain in all 896 lines and about 5,660 words. Now this is in itself scanty enough. But the matter is rendered even more discouraging by the considerable difficulties which the interpretation of the Gâthâs offers in many passages. Several lines and strophes are so obscure that it is difficult to settle a definite translation. Very often we are compelled to admit that the one as well as the other rendering is possible ; however, none can be regarded as absolutely right, and none as absolutely false. But such obscure strophes and lines are either not at all, or only with the greatest reserve and caution, to be admitted as proofs for any essential exposition of the subject to be treated. Often enough, too, a translator will regard as certain and doubtless what others will dispute. *Under all circumstances the utmost precaution is urgently required in making use of the Gâthâs for any material explanation of the Zoroastrian doctrine.**

While writing this discourse we have been well aware of all these difficulties. Nevertheless, we are able to assert that the original form of Zoroastrianism, the philosophical and religious ideas of its founder and of its first professors can be represented, at least in their general features, upon the basis of the Gâthâ texts, and that such a glimpse into the earliest ages of *one of the purest and most sublime religions which have ever existed,** must be considered as exceedingly instructive.

Regarding the Gâthâs, we directly meet with an objection in the beginning of our research, which must be refuted before we can enter into the subject before us. The points in question may be summed up as follows : Whether the Gâthâs proceed from Zarathushtra or his first adherents or disciples ; whether they actually reach back to the primitive age of Zoroastrianism ; nay, whether they are in general older than the rest of the Avesta. Among the Avesta scholars in Europe there are many who dispute all these points, who want to make Zarathushtra a " mythical " person, and who take the differences between the Gâthâs and the rest of the Avesta to be not of a temporal but of a local nature. Thus they assume that the Gâthâs were composed

* The *Italics* are marked by an asterisk when they are mine.—*Trans. note*,

in other parts of Irân than, for example, the Yashts and the Vendidad, and especially that the difference of the dialects is sufficiently explained from this circumstance. However, this idea seems to lose more and more ground in modern times, and the latest translator of the Gâthâs, the Rev. Dr. L. H. Mills, maintains their antiquity with great resoluteness.

*The metrical form of the Gâthâs can scarcely be adduced as proof for their higher antiquity,** because in the rest of the Avesta we also find numerous pieces which were originally composed in metre. In many passages the metre is still preserved intact. In other passages no doubt the text must first be cleared from the additions and interpolations made in the first redaction of the Avesta. Already of greater importance would be the circumstance that the majority of the verses in the Gâthâs is so well preserved, incomparably better than in the metrical fragments of the remaining Avesta. This certainly proves that in the redaction mentioned above the Gâthâs are looked upon as something holier and more inviolable (*lit.*, "untouchable") than the texts otherwise transmitted to us.

*The anomalous dialect of the Gâthâs, too, does not prove to us that they are older than the rest of the Avesta.** The dialect of the former indeed shows many forms which are more antiquated, but also many which seem to be more polished and changed. All this is far better explained by a local than by a temporal difference of the two dialects.

But what undoubtedly distinguishes the Gâthâs from all the other parts of the Avesta and marks them as far older, is their contents,* which evidently carry us into the period of the foundation of the new doctrine, into the time when Zarathushtra and his first adherents still lived and worked, while in the younger Avesta they are no doubt personalities of a remote past.

This has already been set forth by me most decidedly on a former occasion in my "*Ostirânische Kultur im Alterthum*," and our exposition is yet in no way confuted. Lately, Dr. Mills¹ has expressed the same ideas:—"In the Gâthâs all is sober and real. The Kine-soul is indeed poetically described as wailing aloud, and the Deity with His Immortals is reported as speaking, hearing, and seeing; but with these rhetorical exceptions everything which occupies the attention is practical in the extreme. Grehma and Bendva, the Karpans, the Kavis, and the Usijs (-ks) are no mythical monsters. No dragon threatens the settlements, and no fabulous beings defend them. Zarathushtra, Jâmâspa, Frashaoshtra, and Maidhyô-mâh, the Spitâmas, Hvôgvas, the Haêchat-aspas, are as real, and are alluded to with a simplicity as unconscious as any characters in history. Except inspiration, there are also no miracles."

* The *Italics* are marked by an asterisk when they are mine.—*Trans. note.*

¹ The Zend Avesta, Part III, The Yasna, etc., translated by L. H. Mills (The Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXXI., Introduction, p. xxvi).

We shall still often have occasion to refer to this, I might say, realistic character of the Gâthâs, and the truth of the thesis established by us above, that *the Gâthâs belong to the epoch of the foundation of Zoroastrianism*,* will then in due course appear to the reader himself. It will occur above all when we fix our eyes upon the parts played by Zarathushtra and the other characters in the Gâthâs, who in the traditional history of the Parsees are regarded as his contemporaries.

The later legend regarding Zarathushtra, his life, and his works, furnishes us with the following details from which we have excluded all embellishments which can easily be recognised as such.¹ Zarathushtra is descended from a kingly family. His pedigree can be traced back to Minucheher. Among his forefathers are Spitama and Haêchat-aspa. Pourushaspa is his father. The holy religion is revealed to Zarathushtra by Ahura Mazda; and by Zarathushtra first of all to Maidyô-mâh, the son of Zarathushtra's uncle Arâsti. At the command of God Zarathushtra goes to the court of King Gushtâsp of Baktria, in order to promulgate his doctrine there. The wise Jâmâspa is the King's minister. The prophet succeeds in winning him over to himself, as well as his brother Frashaoshtra, next the King himself and his consort, and therewith he puts the new faith on a firm footing. Zarathushtra married Hvôvi, a daughter of Jâmâspa. He died at a mature age, having been destined to live long enough to witness the first fruits of his announcement of the religion.

* The *Italics* are marked by an asterisk when they are mine.—*Trans. note.*

¹ *Cfr.* Spiegel, *Iranische Altertumskunde*, Vol. I, p. 684 *seq.*:—"Gushtâsp and Zoroaster," translated from the German of Spiegel, by Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana, *vide* Vol. II of the "Civilization of the Eastern Iranians," pp. 189—192.

CHAPTER I.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GĀTHĀS.

Now we cast a glance at the names of persons occurring in the Gāthās. It is very remarkable that they all relate to the legend about Zarathushtra as we have already abridged it by excluding from it all exaggerations. We find mentioned the names of Zarathushtra, Vishtāspa, Jāmāspa, Pourushaspa, besides Maidhyômāogh ; the family names of Hvôgva, Spitāma, and Haêchat-aspa ; and the families of Jāmāspa and Zarathushtra themselves. Lastly, the daughter of the prophet is mentioned. But, with a single exception, we find none of the names very often occurring in the well-known heroic legends of Irân and also in the remaining parts of the Avesta—neither Thraêtaona nor Keresāspa, neither Haoshya gha nor Kavi Husrava nor Arjat-aspa. Yima only is named in a single passage.

Is this a mere accident ? Or, rather, is not the assumption more probable that the Gāthās are descended from Zarathushtra himself and his companions, and delineate the experience, hopes, wishes, and fears of that narrow circle from which they have emanated ? It will be easy to ascertain the truth of this assumption, if we undertake to examine the passages where these names occur.

Zarathushtra is, to my knowledge, named altogether sixteen times in the entire Gāthās ; in the Gāthâ Ahunavaiti three times, in the Gāthâ Ushtavaiti five times, in the Gāthâ Spentâ-mainyu twice, in the Gāthâ Vohu-khshathra twice, and lastly, more often in proportion to its extent, four times in the Gāthâ Vahishtô-ishti. Nevertheless, this last Gāthâ plainly appears to me to be the youngest of all. The introductory strophes in which Zarathushtra Kavi Vishtāspa, Pouru-chishta, the daughter of Zarathushtra, and Frashaoshtra are mentioned, seem to me to comprehend a retrospective view of the Zoroastrian epoch. I do not believe that these strophes have originated directly from any of these persons.

Of greater importance are the passage wherein Zarathushtra speaks of himself in the first person. As for instance, *Yasna* XLVI, 19, says :—" He who in righteousness seeks to evince goodness to me—to me Zarathushtra—for him the heavenly spirits will grant as a reward that which is most fit to strive for, namely, the eternal beatitude." I mean, it is evident, that we have here before us words uttered by Zarathushtra himself. Such a passage is perfectly distinguished from the passages of the later Avesta, wherein the prophet does not speak himself, but is made to speak by the composer of the texts ; as for example, the beginning of *Yasna* IX (which undoubtedly contains an old hymn, but which at the first glance seems to have originated long after Zarathushtra) when it says :—" At the time of morning Haoma came to Zarathushtra as he was consecrating the fire and reciting aloud the Gāthās. And Zarathushtra asked Haoma :—' Who art thou then, O man ! Who art of all the incarnate world the most beautiful in thine own body of those whom I have seen, O glorious one ? ' "

We are certainly authorized from the entirely distinct manner in which Zarathushtra is mentioned in the former and the latter passage, to draw a conclusion as to their relative age. In an analogous way Prof. Oldenberg has recently proved a remarkable distinction between the older and the younger hymns of the Rig-veda, according as the manner of the poet's expression is such and such, which may or may not demonstrate the fact of his having been synchronous with certain historical events. Thus Rigveda VII, 18, is distinguished from the rest of the hymns of the same book as far older, because its author speaks of the great battle which King Sudâs fought as of something which had but just happened, while in other hymns mention is made of the same battle as an event of the past time.

But if we accept the strophe, *Yasna* XLVI, 19, as the words of Zarathushtra, we might just as well assert the same undoubtedly for all the hymns contained in the same chapter. It is, however, uncommonly rich in personal allusions. In the 14th strophe Zarathushtra is accosted with the words : " O Zarathushtra, who is thy friend ? " This, nevertheless, does not at all controvert our opinion that all these hymns originate from Zarathushtra himself. The poet in a purely poetical liveliness lets this question be put to himself, upon which he himself gives the answer : " It is he himself, Kavi Vishtâspa." Expressed in other words, the passage simply means : " I have found no better friend and adherent than Kavi Vishtâspa."

Further on, the poet, *i.e.*, Zarathushtra, alludes to his own family, the Spitâmidæ, and makes mention of Frashaoshtra and Dê Jâmâspa, and, at the end, in the words quoted above, speaks of himself in the first person. And he promises all those that joined him, paradise as the reward of the faithful.

If we next refer to the Gâthâ Ushtavaiti, we find in it another hymn, *viz.*, *Yasna* XLIII, which vividly reminds us of what is described above. Here, too, the poet asks himself the question :—Who art thou then, and whose son ? And again he gives the answer himself : " I am Zarathushtra, an open enemy of all evil ; but to the pious I will be a powerful helper as long as I am able to do so." And the poet concludes this time with a reference to himself in the third person : " Now Zarathushtra and with him all those who adhere to Ahura Mazda, declare themselves for the world of the Good Spirit."

This use of the third person, when the poet speaks of himself, should not surprise us. It is found exactly so in the Rig-veda. Here it is said :—" So has the Vasishtha, *i.e.*, I, the singer, who is descended from the race of the Vasishtha, praised the powerful Agni " (VII, 42, 6) ; and then again :—" We, the Vasishthas, wish to be thy adorers " (VII, 37, 4) ; and so on expressed in one form or another. Evidently, it was thus quite usual in the ancient hymnology that the composer mentioned himself in the third person, and this use is also not quite unknown in our modern poetry.

From the Gâthâ Ushtavaiti we pass on again to the Gâthâ Ahunavaiti. Here we light on a striking change. In *Yasna XXVIII*, 7-9, the poet speaks of himself in the first person ; so there exists also no doubt that he lived in the period of the foundation of the new doctrine ; however, I am inclined to think that Zarathushtra is not the author, but one of his friends and contemporaries. In the three strophes mentioned above (*Yasna XXVIII*, 7-9), the same poet prays to God in the following manner :—" Bestow (Thy) powerful spiritual help upon Zarathushtra and upon all of us ," in the next strophe :—" Grant power unto Vishtâspa and to me ," and in the following verse :—" I beseech Thee, grant the best good to the hero Frashaoshtra and to me." The parallelism is so clear in these three stanzas that we can only assume that the poet here represents himself as somebody distinct from Zarathushtra, Vishtâspa and Frashaoshtra. Hence he was not Zarathushtra himself.

Just as the Gâthâ *Yasna XXVIII* does not originate in my opinion from Zarathushtra, but from one of his disciples or adherents, so also does the Gâthâ *Yasna XXIX*. In the latter hymn the composer or the bard makes *geush urvan*, " the kine-soul," implore the heavenly spirits for help and for salvation from the misery and embarrassment in this world, which befall her from evil people. The heavenly spirits make her look for the mission of Zarathushtra as a prophet, by whose teaching or doctrine the remedy against that evil shall be procured. *Geush-urvan*, however, is not satisfied with this promise, since she does not wish to have a powerless mortal as helper and saviour. Now, according to my interpretation, this Gâthâ *XXIX* concludes with a strophe, wherein Ahura Mazda promises that He would help on the weak ones and replenish Zarathushtra with His grace and power, so that He might be capable of thereby carrying out His difficult commandment. But whatever may be the case, whether this Gâthâ concludes actually in the somewhat uncertain manner in which it does in its present surviving shape, or whether the strophe which formerly formed the end is lost, it seems very probable that the original composer of these hymns was not Zarathushtra himself but one of his friends, who refers to the prophet as the man that was chosen and sent into this world by God for the purpose of annihilating the work of the evil people.

The remaining chapters or hymns of the Gâthâ Ahunavaiti present no sure clue to its authorship. In *Yasna XXXIII*, 14, Zarathushtra is only once mentioned in the third person : " Thus, as an offering Zarathushtra gives the life of his very body," which does not enable us to form any opinion. But it is certain that all these hymns belong to the lifetime of Zarathushtra. They presuppose all the relations and conditions of life which, as we shall see further on, are characteristic of that period. But whether the prophet himself is their author, appears to be uncertain. Several times their tone and character are doctrinal, and the dogmas of the Zoroastrian religion are explained at large, which seem to speak more for the assumption that a disciple of the prophet had composed them, who had now clothed in a compact and definite form

and transmitted to the people of the world whatever he had heard directly from the prophet's mouth.

In the Gāthā Spentā-mainyu (*Yasna* XLIX, 8) the poet mentions himself along with Frashaoshtra without even specifying his own name. In the following stanza Jāmāspa is mentioned in connection with another professor of the new doctrine, who, might perhaps be understood to be Vishtāspa. (*Vide* Dr. Mills, S.B.E., Vol. XXXI, p. 166).¹ Nothing prevents us from believing that Zarathushtra is the great speaker. It is, however, certain that the poet lived in the age of the prophet. The forty-ninth hymn ends with the words :— "What hast Thou as a help for Zarathushtra who invokes Thee?" which does not speak quite against the authorship of the prophet.

Of still greater importance is the hymn that follows, *Yasna* L, 5-6, a passage the right sense of which has first been explained by Dr. Mills.² Here mention is made of Zarathushtra in the third person, as of one who declares the songs and sayings or the *māthras* to Ahura Mazda and the heavenly beings and then prays : "In good mind may he announce my laws." The author here evidently stands next to Zarathushtra, just as we have already observed him in *Yasna* XXVIII. Perhaps it is Vishtāspa who here speaks, perhaps Jāmāspa. At all events he appears to be less a priest than a prince or a grandee in the land, who makes use of the important authority of Zarathushtra in order to introduce in league with him all kinds of reforms in the political and social order of affairs. We will observe that Zarathushtra is in fact a great reformer in social as well as religious matters, therefore, such an idea is not absolutely impossible.

That the Gāthā Vahishtō-ishti belongs in my opinion to a later, perhaps even a post-Zarathustrian period, I have briefly stated beforehand. As to the still surviving hymn, *Yasna* LI, i.e., the Gāthā Vohukhshathrem, I would again be inclined to ascribe it to Zarathushtra himself. This assumption is already confirmed by the fact that this hymn bears unmistakeable resemblances to *Yasna* XLVI, which we likewise assume to be Zarathushtra's own. Dr. Mills

¹ *Yasna* XLIX, 9 :—

"Laws let the zealous hear to help us fitted ;
Let no true saint hold rule with the faithless,
Souls should unite in blest rewardings only ;
With Jāmāsp thus united is the brave (hero)!"

² [*Vide* "The Sacred Books of the East," p. 167 seq. :—

"The most striking circumstance here, after the rhetorical and moral religious peculiarities have been observed, is the sixth verse ; and as to the question of Zarathustrian authorship, it is the most striking in the Gāthās or the Avestā. In that verse we have Zarathushtra, not named alone, which might easily be harmonized with his personal authorship, nor have we only such expressions as 'to Zarathushtra and to us' (*Yasna*, XXVIII, 7) ; but we have Zarathushtra named as *mahiya rāzeny sđhit*, 'may he declare my regulations,' which could only be said without figure of speech, by some superior, if not by the prime mover himself. Were these verses then written by the prime mover ? And was he other than Zarathushtra ? Zarathushtra was mentally and personally the superior of all of them. In fact, he was the power behind both throne and home, and yet without a name!" *Trans. note*].

has referred to it in the thirty-first volume of "The Sacred Books of the East," p. 182.

Just as in *Yasna*, XLVI, 14,¹ so in *Yasna* LI, 11, the poet puts himself the question : " Who, O Ahura ! is a loyal friend to the Spitâma, to Zarathushtra ? " He answers then for the first time in the negative :—" Vicious heretics and false priests have never gained the approval of Zarathushtra " (see § 12).² These are exposed to perdition, while Zarathushtra grants to his followers the prospect of paradise as their reward (see §§ 13-15). And now he enumerates all his friends :—In the first place he names Kavi Vishtâspa then the Hvôgvi Frashaoshtra and Jâmâspa, and, lastly, the Spitâmid Maid-dhyô-mâogh. Characteristic are the words at the conclusion of strophe 18, which, however, seem to be suitable only in the mouth of Zarathushtra : " And grant me also, O Mazda ! that they, that is Vishtâspa and Frashaoshtra and Jâmâspa, may adhere firmly to Thee." Accordingly, God is solicited to fortify and strengthen the belief of the first adherents, so that they would truly adhere to the doctrine of Zarathushtra, which they have already recognized as true and right.

The results of our investigations upon the personal names occurring in the Gâthâs, and specially upon the references to Zarathushtra in them, are as follows :—

1. The Gâthâs were all composed in the age of Zarathushtra with the single exception of *Yasna* LIII, and they are distinguished, therefore, essentially from the rest of the Avesta in which Zarathushtra is a personage of the past period.

2. Some of the Gâthic hymns, particularly *Yasna* XLVI, XLIX, and LI, were very probably composed by Zarathushtra himself.

3. Other hymns do not directly proceed from Zarathushtra, but from one of his friends and followers or disciples, which may be proved with some certainty from *Yasna* XXVIII, XXIX, and L.

4. Under all circumstances we have here a collection of hymns wherein the same spirit prevails throughout, and all of which give expression to the same wishes and hopes, sorrows and fears, to the same joyfulness of the faith, and to the same trust in God. Our theme " Zarathushtra in the Gâthâs " is, therefore, now to be treated more concisely as : THE REFORM OF ZARATHUSHTRA ACCORDING TO THE CONTEMPORARY DELINEATIONS OF THE GÂTHÂS.

¹ [§ 14. " Whom hast thou Zarathustra ! thus a holy friend for the great cause ? Who is it who thus desires to speak it forth ? " (Zarathushtra answers.) " It is our Kavi Vishtâspa, the heroic." *Trans. note*].

² " Paederast never gained his ear, nor kavi-follower," (Mills, S. B. E.).

CHAPTER II.

THE RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL REFORM OF ZARATHUSHTRA.

As we have stated above, Zarathushtra was a reformer as much in the social as in the religious sphere. A glance at the contents of the Gâthâs, provides us with sufficient information as to this. No great reform can be achieved without the waging of battles, and in point of fact it is a period of embittered fighting which unfolds itself before our eyes, when we look at the scenes portrayed in the Gâthâs.

We may represent the matter in the following manner. The Arian people, that is, the still united Indo-Îrânians, in their migrations from the Oxus, had descended southward and settled themselves in the river valleys situated to the North and South of the Hindukush. But here the habitable soil which was available, was insufficient for the accommodation of so great a number of tribes and races. New masses pressed after them from the North, and so it happened that the tribes that had moved forward farthest to the South, had stretched far to the East and entered the valleys of the Indus. A remarkable schism had thereby taken place. Those of the Arians who remained behind in the earlier settlement on the Hindukush, formed the subsequent Îrânian nation ; while those who emigrated towards the East, the subsequent Indian people. The latter were then passing through the Rig-veda epoch of civilization, whilst conquering the modern Punjâb in their fight with *Dâsa* and *Dasyu*. Now for the Îrânians, too, an important period of their history began. The land which they had in their occupation, did not prove quite sufficient to maintain a larger number of nomadic races with their herds ; for such were the Îrânians of that period. The land also was favourable to nomadic life in many parts where the mountains run towards the steppes and gradually subside into lower and broader ridges ; but in other parts where the ground is rough, rugged, and mountainous, it hindered the free and unlimited wandering of the nomads. Thus, naturally, one portion of the Îrânian tribes was very soon compelled to take to a settled life and to practise agriculture. The Îrânian people of the Gâthic period were, in fact, subdivided into husbandmen and nomads, and in the sharp opposition, which obtained between the two, the prophet Zarathushtra played a prominent part. In a number of Gâthic passages we see him standing as an advocate of the settled husbandmen. He admonishes them not to be tired of their good work, to cultivate diligently the fields, and to devote to the cattle that fostering care which they deserved. And far and wide spreads the dominion of husbandmen and " the settlements of the pious people increase," in spite of all molestations, all persecutions, and violence, which they have to suffer from the nomads who attack their settlements in order to desolate their sown-fields and to deprive them of their herds.

It may be sufficient to hint at this primitive condition here in a few words, since this social revolution, which the Avesta-people passed through in the Gâthic period, has already been described at length (in my *Ostirânische Kultur*

im Allerthum), and we may avoid repeating the same in this place. What is here of special interest to us is *the spirit and the religious sentiments of Zarathushtra*, and of his friends and first adherents as they appear in the great conflict, and as far as it can be understood from the Gâthâs.

The conflict between the nomads and the agriculturists, between the followers of the prophet and his enemies, was bitter and of varying fortune. There were times of despair and extreme embarrassment, so that the prophet disparagingly utters the words :—"To what land shall I turn ; aye, wherein shall I enter." And he laments that even his friends and relations leave him beset with difficulties, and the rulers of the land refuse to give him their protection and support (*Yasna XLVI, 1*). Yet such outbursts are proportionately rare in the Gâthâs. Zarathushtra and his friends, indeed, know about a helper out of all difficulties. It is Ahura Mazda, Who has sent them, and Who guides them in all their ways ; unto Him they turn in times of distress, and on Him they look with a firm trust in God.

The poet Zarathushtra, therefore, continues after the opening words of the hymn, which are cited above :—

"Yes, I know that I am poor, that I possess scanty herds or flocks, and scanty followers ; I cry to Thee, behold on me, O Ahura ! and bestow on me help even as a friend bestows help on his friend." (*Yasna XLVI, 2*.)

The consciousness that Ahura Mazda Himself has sent Zarathushtra into this world for the purpose of announcing the new doctrine to mankind, and that God stands always by his side as his adviser or guide, comes out prominently in the Gâthâs. The prophet directly expresses it (*Yasna XLV, 5*), when he says that God communicated to him the Word which is the best for man. From the beginning he was chosen for that Revelation (*Yasna XLIV, 11*). He declares himself prepared to undertake the functions and duties of a prophet :—"I will profess myself as Your adorer, and will continue so as long as I may be able through the support of *Asha*;" and he prays only that Ahura Mazda may bestow success on his work (*Yasna L, 1*). With pride he styles himself the "friend" of Ahura (*Yasna XLIV, 1*)¹, who truly and firmly adheres to Him, and who on his part can rely on His help. In another passage (*Yasna XXXII, 1*) Zarathushtra and his disciples call themselves "the messengers" of Ahura Mazda, through whose mouth God revealed to the world His *mysteries*, that is, His Revelation that was unknown and unheard of till then. Here we are vividly reminded of the same expression (*malâk*) occurring in the Old Testament, which denotes principally angels who serve as "the messengers of God," and who act as intermediaries between Jehovah and man. Then again it denotes the prophets and priests who serve as representatives of Jehovah on earth, and exercise his will ; and, lastly, even the whole Israelite nation which is sent by God among the heathens in order to convert them. Here as well as

¹ Compare analogous passages in the Rigveda 2-38-10 ; 5-85-8 ; 7-29-8 ; etc.

there, namely, among the Israelites as well as among the Irânians, the consciousness is clearly manifest that the new religion is not the work of a man but that God Himself speaks through His prophets, and that the latter are sent on their mission by Him, and that they are His servants, His heralds or His messengers.

This confidence in God has its highest and surest support or confirmation in the belief that, earlier or later, every man has at least to share in, or submit himself to, the lot which is assigned to him by the divine justice, and which he deserves in consequence of his good or bad actions. If in this life the evil person seems oft enough to enjoy an undeserved happiness, the punishment which is his due will, however, befall him directly in the next world. A life in darkness and torment and torture of the soul awaits him yonder. But, on the other hand, the prophet is able to console and strengthen his faithful adherents in all their miseries, struggles, and persecutions, by alluding to the joys of paradise which God will bestow on them in the next life. (Cf. *Yasna* XXX, 4; XXXI, 20; XXXII, 15; XLV, 7; XLVI, 11; and XLIX, 11).

In point of fact such a firm confidence in the divine dispensation, and in an adjustment between reward and punishment in the next world, is always indispensable when enemies abound, when the good cause is found in the highest danger and numbers only a few followers who adhere to it faithfully.

The enemies of the new religion, in the first place, the nomadic tribes that feel disdain for settled life, the establishment of agriculture and careful tending of cattle, still pray to the old nature-gods, the *daevas*, the *dēvas* of the Indians. In the eyes of the adherents of Zarathushtra, or the Gâthic Zarathushtrians, these *daevas* become distinctly evil existences, deceitful idols, and demons. Those men or women who follow these *daevas* or demons, and offer to them sacrifices and reverence, are called friends of the *daevas* (*daevâzushîâ* "dear to the *daevas*," in *Yasna* XXXII, 4), just as Zarathushtra and his followers are designated the friends of Ahura. And still more in a strophe of the Gâthâs the authors say:—"Among the unfaithful to Ahura are seen the demons themselves in bodily forms, and the name of *daeva* shall, likewise, be applicable to such men." (*Yasna* XXXII, 5, etc.)

Another denomination for the unfaithful enemies is the word *khrafstra* (*Yasna* XXXIV, 9), which may mean perhaps "vipers." In another passage they are called *khrafstrâ-hizvâ* "having viperous tongues," (*Yasna* XXVIII, 6), and in a third strophe (*Yasna* XXXIV, 5) the *khrafstra*-men are named immediately and synonymously with the *daevas* themselves. The unfaithful have also their priests, the *Usij*, the *Kavis*, and the *Karapâns* (compare *Yasna* XLIV, 20). The unfaithful are generally designated by the word *dregvantô*; the pious on the contrary are called *saoshyantô* in certain passages (*Yasna* XXXIV, 13; XLVIII, 9; and especially in XLVIII, 12). They (*viz.*, these priests) are naturally the most inveterate enemies of the new doctrine through which their gods are dethroned, and they themselves lose all their influence on

the people. The false priests, the *Usij*, the *Kavis*, and the *Karapans*, often succeeded in bringing the rulers over to their side. "With the princes have the *Kavis* and the *Karapans* united," so complains the holy singer in *Yasna* XLVI, 11, in order to corrupt man by their evil deeds. Self-evidently it was of the highest importance that the rulers should come to a determination as to the side they should take in such a matter ; for if the prince professed the new religion or stood opposed to it, his subjects as a rule very likely followed him. Hence it is that Zarathushtra now and then praises the religious fidelity of *Vishtâspa*, and hence the reason why the poet prays to God :—" May good princes reign over us, but not wicked princes ! "

Among the princes that stood against Zarathushtra as his enemies, the mighty *Bendva* might be included, who is mentioned in *Yasna* XLIX, 1-2. From the context of the passages we can of course conclude that he stood on the side of the infidels. A family or a race of princely blood were probably the *Grê'ma* (*Yasna* XXXII, 12-14). Regarding them it is said that they, having allied with the *Kavis* and the *Karapans*, have established their power in order to overpower the prophet and his partisans ; but sneeringly it is said of them that they will attain in hell the sovereignty for which they are striving. With all their adherents, the idolaters and false priests, they will go to eternal perdition. But the prophet, who is here in this world so much abused and distressed will enter with his family, relations, and followers, into the joys of paradise.

Now, it is interesting to observe how the composers of the *Gâthâs* place themselves in contrast with these their enemies, and what sorts of ideas and sentiments they set forth against them. First, it is regarded as a sacred obligation to convert the infidels by means of words and doctrine (*Yasna* XXVIII, 5). The religion of Zarathushtra is a religion of culture, of spiritual and moral progress and proficiency. It penetrates through all conditions of human life, and it considers every action of life, as for instance, the clearing of the soil, the careful tending of herds, and the cultivation of the fields, from the standpoint of religious duty. Such a religion, or such a philosophy, cannot be confined to a narrow circle ; the propagation of it and the conversion of all men to it, are ideas which are at the basis of its very essence. We, accordingly, find complete hymns, as *Yasna* XXX and XLV, which were evidently intended to be delivered before a numerous audience, and in which Zarathushtra, or one of his friends, expounds the essential points of the new doctrine for the approval of the hearers. Such a position follows clearly from the beginning strophe of the forty-fifth *Gâthic* hymn :—

" I will announce it, now hear and understand,
Ye who have come from near and from afar !
Now hast Thou made evident all, O Mazda !
In order that no false teacher shall again destroy the life (of our mind)
Through false beliefs, a wicked person who speaks forth evil texts."

Evidently has *Vishtâspa*, or else another provincial ruler, permitted his people to meet in a large assembly. In this assembly the *Kavis* and the

Karapans may have delivered their sons in which they revered the *daevas*, the gods of storm and thunder, of the sun and stars. Probably they, too, brought offerings to their gods to gain their assistance in any enterprise, or to propitiate their wrath. But now Zarathushtra steps forward and addresses the assembly. To his triumphant eloquence the priests of the nature-religion had to give way, and his doctrine or religion, "until then unheard," which declared Ahura Mazda as the sublime Creator of the world and expounded the sacred duty of all men to fight strongly against the infernal power of evil, was re-echoed and applauded by the attentive audience. Not bloody offerings or senseless customs constitute the true worship of God; but the moral purity of the mind, an ardent fulfilment of the duties to which man is invited in this life as well as piety and industry.

Whenever the prophet meets with an open opposition, and all preachings and expositions prove fruitless, then he denounces upon his opponents the full burden of divine wrath. The good shall hate the evil. There is no reconciliation, no forbearance, no connivance. Every act of forbearance in such a case would be a sin, because it encourages evil rather than destroys it.

This spirit of intense hatred against the wicked stands, I believe, parallel to the ideas of the Old Testament. In the latter scriptures Moses, too, summons the Levites to draw their swords and to kill the apostates who instead of holding firmly to the worship of Jehovah made a golden image and adored it (2 *Moses* 32, 25 *seq.*). Jehovah is a "jealous god," a god of wrath, who commands to destroy the idols of the pagans and to throw down their altars:—"God of vengeance, Jehovah, God of vengeance, show thyself." So the psalmodist invokes him (*Psalms* 94). "Lift up thyself, thou judge of the earth: render reward to the overbearing! How long shall the wicked triumph, Jehovah? . . . They congregate to threaten the life of the righteous, and condemn the innocent blood. But Jehovah is my citadel, and my God is the rock of refuge. He shall repay them their injustice, and shall annihilate them on account of their malice. Jehovah our God shall extirpate them." "Jehovah saves all who love him: but he destroys the wicked" (*Psalms* 145. 20.) Through perverseness Jehovah's indignation will be excited; now he grows angry and pays with the sword those who revolted from him (*Psalms* 78. 56 *seq.*). When the sons of Korah rebelled against Moses, Jehovah split the earth, and Korah with his relations, family, and property, was swallowed by it (4 *Moses* 16, 1 *seq.*).

These passages from the Old Testament are culled at random. It would be easy to multiply them tenfold. The hatred which does not tolerate connivance with the sinner; but demands and expects his immediate punishment, yea, even his total annihilation by the divine justice, is even a trait of the old Israelitish spirit. We cannot refuse it our admiration. There is vigour and energy free from all feeble wavering, rising to violence and fanaticism. And now when Zarathushtra proclaims in the *Gâthâs*:—"Would that I could be a

tormentor for the wicked, but a friend and helper for the pious " (*Yasna XLIII*, 8) ; or when he admonishes the people :—" None of you shall mind the doctrine and precepts of the wicked ; because thereby he will bring grief and death in his house and village, in his land and people ! No, grip your sword and cut them down ! " (*Yasna XXXI*, 18) ; or when he denounces death and ruin upon those who did not adhere to him. All this vividly puts us in mind of the spirit of the Old Testament.

In fact, the opposition between the pious and the impious, the believers and the unbelievers, seems very often to have led to open combat. The prophet prays to Ahura that He may grant victory to his own when both the armies rush together in combat, whereby they can cause defeat among the wicked, and procure for them grief and trouble (*Yasna XLIV*, 14, 15). Whosoever deprives the liar and the false teacher of his power or of his life, can count upon Ahura's favour or grace (*Yasna XLVI*, 4). In any case, however, the wicked will not escape the eternal judgment, and if not already in this world, certainly in the next world, Ahura will inflict punishment upon them and dash them into the torments of hell and damnation (*Yasna XXXI*, 20 ; *XLV*, 7 ; *XLVI*, 6, 11 ; *XLIX*, 11).

CHAPTER III.

ZARATHUSHTRA'S MONOTHEISM.

That the Reform of Zarathushtra called forth a lively agitation of the mind, that it even gave occasion to bloody combats and wars, is easily understood from the contents of the Gâthâs. It broke away almost entirely from all ideas extant before the Gâthic period, and offered in fact something quite new. It placed itself in a conscious opposition to the religion of nature which had been handed down from the old Arian times, and was still cherished by the people; and whatever it took over from the nature-worship and retained in itself, was exalted into a far higher moral sphere and penetrated with its spirit; and thus the form acquired a new substance.

Here we speak of the Gâthâs and their contents, not of the entire Avesta, because it seems to me—and the surviving chapters will prove it—that the Gâthâs plainly preserve Zoroastrianism in its purest and most original form, as the founder of this sublime religion had thought out and imparted it. If the present Parsees, the modern professors of the Zoroastrian religion, would learn to be familiar with its contents and spirit, as it originated directly from the prophet, they would always have to refer to the Gâthâs; and they ought to endeavour to penetrate deep into the meaning which is indeed often obscure and difficult. I believe that it will also have an important practical effect in increasing their love and esteem, and in preserving in a pure state this religion as a rare and valuable possession.

The prophet, too, qualifies his religion as “unheard of words” (*Yasna* XXXI, 1), or as a “mystery” (*Yasna* XLVIII, 3), because he himself regards it as a religion quite distinct from the belief of the people hitherto. The revelation he announces, is to him no longer a mere matter of sentiments, no longer a merely undefined presentiment and conception of the Godhead, but *a matter of intellect, of spiritual perception and knowledge*.* This is of great importance; for there are probably not many religions of so high an antiquity in which this fundamental doctrine, that *religion is a knowledge or learning, a science of what is true*, * is so precisely declared as in the tenets of the Gâthâs. It is the unbelieving that are unknowing; on the contrary, the believing are learned, because they have penetrated into this knowledge (*Yasna* XXX, 3). Every one that is able to distinguish even spiritually between what is true and what is untrue, will enlist himself on the side of the prophet (*Yasna* XLVI, 15). Between the truthful (*adrujyantô*, “not speaking lies”) and the liars there is strictly the same antithesis as between the believers and the unbelievers, the adherents and the opponents of the new religion (*Yasna* XXXI, 15, etc.). It is thereby expected from every individual that he or she should take a place in the great question, and come to a decision on the one or the other side. “Man for man” shall the people examine or test whatever the prophet has announced to them (*Yasna* XXX, 2), and learn thereof the truth. Clearly enough it is an open breach with the old national religion. To the follower of

Zarathushtra the religion is no longer a "reliance" on unknown and more or less unintelligible higher powers; it is to him rather a "*freedom*" of the spirit, an exemption from all superstitions and false notions, an independent penetration into the perception of the divine truth which was to him a mystery before then.* That the religion should develop from a feeling of dependence into that of freedom, is the most important step that could be taken generally in the sphere of religious life.

We will again mention the Old Testament where belief and perception, unbelief and folly, are likewise regarded as identical ideas. I need only refer to the famous passage of *Psalms* 14, :—"The fool speaketh in his heart. There is no God. Corrupt and abominable are their works; there is none among them, that doeth good. But Jehovah looks down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, that seek God; but all are apostatized, all are corrupted; none is there that doeth good, no, not one." (Cfr. *Psalms* 53, 2.)

But wherein consists the new doctrine "unknown till then" of the Zoroastrian religion, as it clearly emanates from the Gâthâs? It exists in the *preponderating monotheistic character of this religion*. Its founder has got rid of the plurality in which the Godhead had been split up by the popular belief and naturalism, and elevated himself to the *preception of the divine unity* which pervades nature in manifold ways.

It is sufficiently known that in the Zoroastrian religious system *Ahura Mazda* is conceived as the Ruler and Commander in heaven and on earth, and as the Highest and the First of the Genii. This double name, in the given consecutive order, occurs in the later Avesta as the constant and established designation of God. Exceptions to this use are not found in it, or are certainly met with very seldom only. The case is different in the Gâthâs, and I come thereby to a most highly significant distinction between the old hymns and the younger fragments of the Zoroastrian religious documents. Such a name as became afterwards stereotyped for the Godhead, does not yet exist in the Gâthâs. We find sometimes *Ahura*, sometimes *Mazda*, sometimes *Ahura Mazda*, and sometimes *Mazda Ahura* applied to the Deity. God can be designated by "Lord" (*Ahura*) as well as by "All-wisdom or Omniscience" (*Mazdâo*). It seems even that in the Gâthâs the appellative signification of the two names had been felt still more than in the later writings. This is proved by the passages wherein *Ahura Mazda* (*Yasna* XXX, 9; XXXI, 4), or *Mazda* alone (*Yasna* XXXIII, 1; XLV, 1), is used in the plural number. The *Mazdâonghō* then evidently form the totality of the heavenly spirits. If we further consider the fact that in the old Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Achæmenian dynasty occurs the name of God, *Auramazdâ*, as a single word which is only inflected at the end, it certainly follows hence that we have to deal here with the results of development in different historical epochs. Generally speaking, Zarathushtra had not found out originally any exact proper name for the Godhead. He designated Him sometimes by one, sometimes by another

name, but we can translate most of the different names, which are used in the Gâthâs, simply by "God." Later on the name Ahura Mazda was strictly adhered to exactly in the same relation and succession of the two words, and therewith was now for the first time created a real or definite name of the Deity, the use of which corresponds to the name of Jehovah in the Old Testament. In a still later period the two names blended into one, because they were continually used in the same succession as though they formed a compound. Nevertheless, both the component parts are still discernible from the name *Auramazdâ*, since they are both declined in one passage only of an Inscription of Xerxes. The last phase of development is represented by the forms of the name used in middle and modern Irânian dialects: Pahlavi *Auharmazd*, and modern Persian *Ormazd*. The blending of the two words is here so complete that they do no longer bear an independent meaning in the final form.

Now the essence of polytheism consists in the religion in which man exalts the different powers of nature separately to individual godheads, and fixes the limit of their sphere of activity against each other. Generally speaking, we can, therefore, call the religion of the Rigveda a polytheistic doctrine. *Indra* is the god of weathers; *Agni* rules over the fire; the *Maruts* are the genii of storms. However, there exist already in the Vedic hymns ideas which lead us gradually upwards from polytheism to monotheism. We can observe how the virtue or efficiency of one or more gods is here and there transferred to an individual god. This is especially the case in many of the hymns dedicated to *Varuna*. In those hymns Varuna is represented as the creator of the universe, as the giver of all good things, as the warden of truth, and the avenger of sins. (*Vide* Rigveda I, 25, 20; II, 27, 10; VII, 86, 1 *seq.*) In other sacred songs the same qualities and powers are transferred to other gods: thus *Indra*, *Soma*, and *Agni* may be occasionally regarded as the highest gods. Of the last mentioned god, *Agni*, it is said directly in Rigveda V., 3, that he is the same as *Indra*, *Vishnu*, *Savitri*, *Pûshan*, *Rudra* and *Âditi*; accordingly he is identified with the whole body of the gods.

Thus we can observe in the Rigveda how the singers and priests search after the conception of the divine unity, and how they are kept away from it for this reason only that they have not the moral courage to break with the notions, conceptions, and names, which are handed down since ages. In the Gâthâs the position is different. The important step which the Vedic singers lingered to take, was adopted by the Gâthic Irânians. The plurality of the nature-gods is set aside, and *one* God is selected in their place, who comprehends all, and is as great and as powerful as the Jehovah of the Old Testament, and at any rate not more anthropomorphous than the latter.

In the 104th *Psalm*, Jehovah is extolled as the creator and regent of the world. "Light is the garment which he puts on. He stretcheth out the heaven like a tent. He vaulteth his chamber with water. He maketh the clouds his chariot and ascendeth upon the wings of the wind. He maketh the winds his messengers and the fire-flame his ministers. He propeth the earth

upon its foundations so that it quaketh not for ever. He created the moon to regulate the seasons, the sun knoweth his going down. Thou makest darkness that there will be night, wherein all the beasts of the forest stir about. The young lions roar after their prey and seek their meat from God. The sun riseth : these beasts run away and couch themselves in their dens, when the man goeth out to his work and keepeth himself to his daily labour until the evening."

I would put side by side with this Psalm some stanzas from the Gāthā XLIV, where Ahura Mazda appears as the almighty God, Who created the universe, Who maintains it, and rules over it. The resemblances between the 44th Gāthā and the 104th Psalm strike us at once, and we must concede without any hesitation that the author of the 44th Gāthā has penetrated into the perception of God, the Creator of the world, not less profoundly than the poet of the Psalms. In *Yasna* XLIV, 3-5 and 7, it is said :—

(3) "This I ask Thee, give me the right answer, O Ahura !

Who was the Generator and the first Father of the world-system ?

Who showed the sun and stars their way ?

Who established it, that the moon thereby waxes and wanes, if Thou doest not ?

These things all, O Mazda! and others still I should like to know."

(4) "This I ask Thee, give me the right answer, O Ahura !

Who hath firmly sustained from beneath the earth and the atmosphere.

That they do not fall down ? Who created the waters and the plants ?

Who hath given their swiftness to the winds and the clouds ?

Who hath created, O Mazda ! the pious thoughts (within our souls) ? ”

(5) "This I ask Thee, give me the right answer, O Ahura !

Who hath created skilfully the light and the darkness ?

Who hath made skilfully sleep and activity ?

Who hath made the auroras, the midday, and the evening,

Which remind the discerning man of his duties ? ”

(7) "This I ask Thee, give me the right answer, O Ahura !

Who hath created the blessed earth together with the sky ?

Who hath through His wisdom made the son in the exact image of the father ?

I will call Thee, O Mazda ! the judicious,

As the Creator of the universe, the most Bountiful Spirit."

The correspondence of the religious ideas mentioned above in the Gâthic hymns and the Psalms, is in point of fact unique. The conformity to law in nature, such as the course of the stars, the waxing and the waning of the moon, and the succession of the daytime during which man's activity is fixed, attracted the attention of both the poets. *In the Gâthâs Ahura Mazda, in the Psalms Jehovah, is the Creator of the Order of the World.* As such Mazda is freely and frequently mentioned in the Gâthâs, He is "the essential Creator of the Order of the World."

منہ دلا دے؟ لیکن میں نے دیا۔ وہ سب دے دے۔

Haithyô ashahyâ dâmish.

in *Yasna* XXXI, 8, an appellation which we must emphasize, as it will hereafter be of importance for considering the relation in which Ahura Mazda stands to the Amesha-spentas.

If Ahura Mazda is the Creator of the world, He, too, deserves all those attributes which are ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament. As we have already remarked Ahura Mazda is the *Holy* and *All-just* ; He hates the evil or wicked, and punishes them in this world as well as in the next according to their due ; but He takes the pious under His protection, and bestows eternal life upon them. He is the *Immutable*, Who is “also now the same” (*Yasna* XXXI, 7) as He has been from eternity ; He is the *Almighty*, Who does what He wills (*Vasê-khshayâs*, *Yasna* XLIII, 1) ; He is the *All-knowing*, Who looks down upon man from heaven (*cfr. Psalms* 14 quoted above), and watches all their projects and designs which are open or secret (*Yasna* XXXI, 13). Ahura Mazda is a *Spirit* ; He is a Being, Who cannot be invested with human traits of character ; He is the *Spenishtâ Mainyû*,¹ “Most Bountiful Spirit” (*Yasna* XLIII, 2) the Absolute Goodness or Bounty. In fact, anthropomorphic ideas or representations are very rare in the Gâthâs. Where such ideas occur, they are to be interpreted as the simple result of poetical usage or license. To Zarathushtra Ahura Mazda was doubtless as much a spiritual, supersensible, incomprehensible and indescribable Being, as Jehovah was to the poets of the Psalms.

Ahura Mazda is certainly called in *Yasna* XXXI, 8 ; XLV, 4 ; XLVII 2, the Father of Vohu-manô, Asha, and Ârmaiti ; but it is to be remembered that Vohu-manô, Asha, and Ârmaiti are only abstract ideas : “the pious mind, holiness, humility and devotion.” Hence it positively follows that we have here not to deal with human ideas or conceptions such as are current in the Greek and Roman mythology ; but simply with a poetical mode of expression. It means nothing more than saying : God is the Father of all goodness, yea, He is “our Father.”

In *Yasna* XLIII, 4, mention is also made of the “hands” of Ahura Mazda. It would be ridiculous if we were to trace therein any anthropomorphism whatever. Such phrases Zarathushtra could use as naturally as the Christian does, when in his prayers he lays all his cares and wishes in the fatherly hands of God. It is neither heathenish nor Muhammedan nor Zoroastrian nor Christian, but a common mode of human expression.

However, any traits which would allow us to infer that Ahura Mazda had been represented in a certain figurative form in the oldest period of Zoroastrianism, are certainly not to be derived from the Gâthâs. If we find in later times, as for example, in the monuments of the Achæmenian kings a figurative representation of Ahura Mazda, I think we ought not to lay much stress upon it. In the first place it is to be observed that the Persians of the Achæmenian period had obtained Zoroastrianism as something foreign from without ; thus they may have added or changed many religious notions. Secondly, has not also Michael Angelo drawn an image of the God Father and therewith given to

¹ In other Gâthic passages *Spenîd-mainyû* seems to be a being distinct from Ahura Mazda ; it is perhaps a particular trait of His nature by which he becomes the giver of bounty in the creation (*Yasna* XLV, 6 ; XLVII, 1 ; etc.)

the ecclesiastical art of the West a type for the representation of the Godhead ?

We have seen that Zarathushtra has arrived at the idea of an Almighty, All-wise, and All-just God, of a Creator and Preserver of the world ; and he has thereby provided his people with the monotheism in the place of a polytheistic nature-worship. Further, we have seen that the manner in which this sole Godhead is conceived, vividly reminds us of the representations of Jehovah in the Old Testament, and indeed so well in the general as in the many particular characteristic features. Nevertheless, I declare it as an *entirely mistaken assumption* that Zarathushtra borrowed the Jehovah idea directly or indirectly from the Israelites. We find nowhere else in the entire Avesta any traces of actual contact between the Irânians and the Semites, which would justify a theory of a borrowing of religious notions or conceptions from one another. Again the cult of Ahura Mazda has yet its genuine national stamp in spite of all resemblances with the Jehovah-worship. Let us only consider the close connection of the religious and economical life, which plays so prominent a part already in the Gâthâs, and forms a characteristic feature of the entire Avesta. Generally I regard it as most hazardous to assume a borrowing on the basis of simple resemblances of religious ideas. If Ahura Mazda and Jehovah bear a certain affinity in idea and comprehension, that is plainly owing to the reason that we have to deal with a monotheism among the Irânians as well as among the Jews. But when monotheism is once firmly established, then certain similar ideas are sure to be forthcoming, which are peculiar to monotheism and form part of its essence. He who does not altogether deny that a people or a pre-eminent genius at any time among a people, can attain independently to the idea of the unity of God—he who does not dogmatically adjudge the monopoly of monotheism to the Jews—will surely agree with me in the assertion that the Irânians had in a very olden time, and without any influence from without *independently acquired through the Zoroustrian Reform the possession of a monotheistic religion.*

CHAPTER IV.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE GĀTHĀS.

We now approach an objection which might possibly be raised against our comprehension of Zarathushtra's doctrine. It might be asked :—Is then Zoroastrianism, indeed, a positive monotheism ? Does not the Avesta extol and profess the existence of a complete list of good spirits such as the *Amesha-spentas*, *Mithra*, *Sraosha*, *Verethraghna*, *Haoma*, *Ardvi-sûra*, and others ? Have not several of these good spirits, as for example *Mithra*, forms which are derived from the pre-Zoroastrian times and are also met with in the Indian Vedic hymns, and which consequently belong, no doubt, to the Arian nature-worship ?

We do not wish to misapprehend the importance of these objections. We are willing to concede to them even a certain justification and truth. *But here is the point where we have surely to distinguish between the Gâthâs and the rest of the Avesta, between the doctrine as it comes directly from Zarathushtra himself and as it developed among the people later in the course of time.* If, indeed, we consider the Gâthâs alone, we light on a far purer monotheism. In the later Avesta the doctrine appears confused and restricted in different ways. Even to-day the Parsee will have to prefer the Gâthâs, if he wishes to understand his religion not only in the oldest, but also in the purest form.

How sharp and definite the representation of the genius *Mithra* appears in the later Avesta, especially in the *Mihir Yasht* dedicated to him ? He is the genius of the morning-sun, who brings hither the light. As such he is the enemy and vanquisher of the demons of night. But he is also the *yazata* of truth, of rights and contracts. The sphere of his might ranges still further. He is prince and king of the earth, the helper in battles whom the warriors invoke at the commencement of fighting, and who helps them on to victory. Lastly, he takes vengeance on the wicked. He especially inflicts punishment on liars and violators of promise.

In a similar manner we can describe *Tishtrya*¹ from the later Avesta. He is the *yazata* of stars, in particular he presides over the star Sirius. To him is attributed the power of distributing rain on dry fields. He fights against the demon of aridity and barrenness. That he has generally in his hands the dominion of the stars cannot be surprising. Also the *Fravashis*, the manes, allot the fertilizing water over the earth ; they distribute in general all sorts of good things, cause trees and plants to thrive, and are like *Mithra* helpers in war and fighting. In short, we have in the later Avesta to deal with genii who vividly remind us of the gods of the Rigveda, of *Varuna*, *Indra*, *Mitra*, and others.

If we now turn again to the Gâthâs, the subject appears to us in quite a different light. Here the names of a *Mithra* or *Tishtrya* are not mentioned

¹ Comp., *ibid.*, pp. 70 ; *seq.*

even once. The Fravashis, too, are never directly alluded to ; so also Haoma, or Verethraghna the angel of victorious battles, or Anâhita the angel of the waters. In the Gâthâs we fail to find the names of all those good spirits who in the later Avesta are especially drawn as plastic representations, and who mostly appear exhibited with individual attributes.

Are we to explain this as a simple accident ? I would regard such a supposition, of course, as an error, although I am convinced on the other side, however doubtful or critical every *documentum esilentio* is. There are sometimes circumstances under which we arrive at nothing by the assumption of an accident, and by which much obscurity and confusion are caused. If in the Gâthâs we could nowhere find a convenient occasion for mentioning Mithra or Tishtraya or the Fravashis generally, it might be explained as an accident when their names do not occur. But such opportunities of mentioning these good spirits, occur sufficiently often in the Gâthâs. Why is Mithra, for example, not alluded to in the passages where the conflict against the unbelievers is mentioned ? It is said of Mithra in *Yasht* X, 36 :—

“ Mithra opens the battle,
He takes his place in the battle ;
And standing in the midst of battle
He breaks as under the lines arrayed (for the battle).”

Or, the Fravashis, too, would have been here fitly invoked ; for

“ They bring the greatest help in fearful battles.” (*Yasht* XIII, 37).

Besides, the Gâthâs speak very often of fields and herds ; but even with such an opportunity Tishtraya is never referred to, although he renders the fields blessed and the herds thriving.

Similar is the case with regard to the other good spirits of whom, too, the Gâthâs make no mention. One cannot say that in general no occasion is found to name them ; but *their non-mention is evidently the result of an object aimed at.*

The entire character of the Gâthâs is so philosophical, abstract, and transcendental, that such yazats or angels as are mentioned above would be quite unsuitable in their theology. I do not say that Zarathushtra and the other poets of the Gâthâs knew altogether nothing about Mithra or Tishtraya or Anâhita. These yazats were, no doubt, much revered by the people ; but the prophet did not approve of such a cult. He wished to substitute higher and more philosophical ideas in the place of these good spirits, who in their entirety too much resembled the gods of the old Arian nature-worship. All those genii that are named in the Gâthâs along with Ahura Mazda, are in point of fact such abstract conceptions ; their position with reference to the monotheistic doctrine of the Gâthâs as is set forth by me, will be indicated later on.

Mithra, Tishtraya, and other yazats, who are not mentioned in the Gâthâs, are in the later Avesta pretty strongly anthropomorphized. They are conceived and described quite in the same way as the godheads of the Rigveda. They are represented in human form, as man or woman (like Anâhita), wearing armour and clothing, bearing weapons, driving in chariots, and dwelling in

palaces. Sometimes they appear even in the shape of animals. But, as we have observed, such anthropomorphous conceptions are quite foreign to the Gâthâs.

Those genii, on the contrary, who with Ahura Mazda are mentioned in the Gâthâs, especially the Ameshaspentas, are very little, or properly speaking not at all, anthropomorphized even in the later Avesta. Sraosha perhaps forms only an exception. In the Gâthâs he is wholly an abstract figure ; but in the later Avesta he is described as a genius whose attributes exhibit many resemblances to those of Mithra.

Hence, we are able to establish an authoritative distinction between the theology of the Gâthâs and that of the later Avesta. In the former only such genii have their place near God as are principally nothing more than abstract ideas ; in the latter, on the contrary, are also mentioned such genii as appear in more plastic forms and may be compared with the gods of the Indians who were originally of the same tribe as the Irânians. If from amongst the names of the genii who belong to the latter category, only one or two did not occur in the Gâthâs, we should be inclined to call it perhaps an accident ; but where the distinction is one so continuous and almost without an exception, certainly we ought to recognize therein a system and purpose.

Now, the question is : How did those genii who are more and more anthropomorphized like Mithra, *etc.*, get into the Zoroastrian system in later times ? I believe that it is not at all difficult to explain this. The Zoroastrian Reform is an energetic opposition against the ancient Arian nature-worship. Consequently, not a single one of the genii that belong to the latter cult, occurs in the Gâthâs. Every opposition naturally goes to the extreme point and seeks its success in the absolute annihilation of the existing system. In a passage of the Gâthâs (*Yasna* XLVIII, 10) the cult of Haoma, at least in the form in which it was at that time practised, is even put down as something despicable and abominable¹. But on such a practice must follow a reaction in due time. The results to which this reaction led, are placed before us in the theological system of the later Avesta. Here we light on a compromise with the older national religion. The gods, who were revered in the latter, are, notwithstanding their altered and spiritualized form, taken back into the new religious system in order to form to a certain extent the holy retinue and court of Ahura Mazda. However, as we have said, the ideas undergo many transformations ; they are adapted to the new circumstances, and this is effected particularly by placing more in the foreground the moral side in the nature of an individual genius than the physical side. This corresponds with the essence of the Zoroastrian system in general, which is principally founded on an ethical basis.

The modern Parsiism, according to the whole tendency of our age, will have again to embrace the form of his religion, as it is given in the Gâthâs. It will place the philosophical element of his faith in the front just in the same way as

¹ [Doubtful. The Pahlavi seems to have understood "magic." Comp. S.B.E., Vol. XXXI, Eng. Trans.]

the Christian will more emphasize the moral power of his religion than its dogmatic doctrines. By giving prominence to what is common to the different religions, the connecting bridge between them is directly found.

To the development of the Zoroastrian religion, as I have described it, similar analogies are also found amongst us in the West. In Germany, too, the first proclaimers of Christianity proceeded with the object of extirpating heathenish beliefs. Nevertheless, at this day every intelligent and unprejudiced investigator concedes the fact that many a heathen element is still found hidden in our national ideas and customs. It is well-known that in the saints as they are worshipped in many countries of Germany, particularly by the country-people, are revived old heathen gods, or rather they are preserved in altered forms and designations. Thus *Thor*, the god of tempest, the constant attendant of *Watan*, has become Saint Peter; and we can no longer be astonished if Peter has also taken upon himself, according to popular belief, other functions too, which had belonged to his heathen predecessor, as for example, the causing of rainy weather. The old conception of a god bringing down the rain has even been retained, but connected with the person of Peter, as *Thor's* name had no longer a place in the new church. As regards Parsiism the case was different. Herein the old appellation also came into use with the religious idea itself. We must here remark that Parsiism is, however, an outcome of the old Irânian nature-religion, while the old German national beliefs was something foreign to Christianity. Thus a compromise was entered into between Christendom and Heathendom by the former accepting many popular ideas which are deeply rooted in the heathenish belief, but impregnating them with the Christian spirit.

Now, the celestial beings whom the Gâthâs mention along with Ahura Mazda, are, as I have already stated, principally the six Amesha-spentas: Vahu-manô, Asha, Khshathra, Ârmaiti, Haurvatât and Ameretât, to whom I add Sraosha and Ashi. It is not my intention to explain in detail the conceptions that are connected with these Amesha-spentas. It would be an idle repetition.¹ For our purpose it may only briefly be said that *Asha* is "the genius of the cosmic and moral order as well as the warden of fire; his name signifies "piety." *Vohu-manô* is the good and pious mind; he protects the herds, with the breeding of which is also united the nursing of the pious mind or feeling. *Khshathra* denotes the "kingdom," the dominion of the pious and faithful here on earth, and the kingdom of heaven in the next world. *Ârmaiti* is the "humility" and "devotion," the preserver of the earth. *Haurvatât* and *Ameretât* denote "welfare" and "immortality;" they rule over water and plants. *Sraosha* is "obedience," especially to the will of God and the precepts of the holy religion. Also *Ashi* appears to bear a similar meaning in the later Avesta.

¹ Cfr. *infra* pp. 88 seq.

Now the question which here interests us is : In what relation do these Amesha-spentas stand to Ahura Mazda ? Will the monotheism, admitted by us in the theology of the Gâthâs, be not impaired and restricted through them, or perhaps even be abandoned ? If we take an external view of the matter, we must concede that the Amesha-spentas scarcely seem to play a part inferior to Ahura Mazda. The word *Asha*, for example, occurs in the Gâthâs about 180 times ; the name *Mazda* about 200 times ; *Vohu-manô* (also *Vahishtem-manô*) perhaps 130 times ; and the rest of the names, of course, not so often. It is not the number of times that a name is mentioned, which enables us to conclude from external evidences as to the varied value of the different ideas ; and still there exists such a distinct difference, that it is quite impossible to place Mazda and Asha in one and the same grade, nay, even to compare them with one another.

Mazda has become, indeed, a proper name to designate the Highest and only One God, no less than Jehovah in the Old Testament, or Allah in the Muhammedan religion. Asha, on the contrary, and even the other Amesha-spentas named above, *can* only occasionally attain to a sort of personification, the original abstract signification being still clearly perceived. In the majority of passages the abstract idea is the only right meaning ; in others we would hesitate to fix the correct import of the word, nay very often the double meaning is perhaps aimed at by the poets of the Gâthâs. Similar personifications of abstract ideas are occasionally noticed also in the *Psalms* (*vide* 85, 11-14) :—
 “ Near lieth Jehovah’s help unto His adorers, so that glory will stay in the land. Mercy and truth have met together ; and righteousness and peace do kiss one another. Truth shall spring out of the earth ; and righteousness shall look down from heaven. Jehovah, too, shall grant happiness, and our land shall yield her produce. Justice shall go before his sight and stalk forward upon her path.”¹

Strictly speaking, Asha and Vohu-manô, Khshathra and Ârmaiti, when they designate abstract conceptions, are, in the first place, no special genii who stand in a line with Mazda ; but they represent certain powers and qualities of the Godhead, which are included in Mazda and in His Essence. Such is at all events the original idea ; but we do not wish to argue that these Amesha-spentas never and nowhere arrived at a certain independence. This is particularly the case in those passages where the Amesha-spentas are named together with Mazda, and stand perfectly parallel to Him. In that case I might compare them with the angels of the Old Testament. The latter were, likewise originally, only phenomenal forms of Jehovah Himself, and later on they constituted to a certain extent His followers and companions or His court. Thus, for example, Mazda’s name appears amongst those of the first Amesha-spentas (*Yasna* XXVIII, 3) :—

“ You, O Asha ! will I praise and the Vohu-manô, the incomparable,
 And the Mazda Ahura, with whom the eternal Khshathra is united,
 And the blessing dispensing Ârmaiti : come hither to my call to help me ! ”

¹ [Here I have followed the authorized English Version of the Bible. *Eng. Trans.*]

And quite similarly *Yasna XXXIII*, 11 (cfr. also 12 and 13).

"Thou Who art the most beneficent Ahura Mazda, and Armaiti,
And Asha who furthurs on the settlements, and Vohu-manô and Khshathra,
Hear me, have mercy upon me, have always kind regard for me for ever."

That Asha and the other Amesha-spentas are, nevertheless, only an emanation from the Essence of Mazda, is poetically expressed in His designation as their Father and Progenitor as well as their Creator. Where God is regarded as the Creator of the spirits existing by and outside of Himself, there can be no reference to any kind of polytheism. The question then—Whether there are any spiritual existences outside of God, who stand to a certain extent as intermediaries between Him and man—has nothing to do with the definition of the idea of monotheism. In reference to the theology of the Gâthâs it is still to be fully maintained that the names of the Amesha-spentas are chiefly abstract conceptions. When Mazda is called the Father of Asha, it only signifies that He has created the moral and the cosmic order. Hence He is also designated *Ashâ hazaosh* "of one will with Asha;" since what He does is in accord with the world ordained by Him. Or when He is called the Father of Vohu-manô and Ârmaiti, it signifies that all good intentions and all humble devotion, that is, every life which is agreeable to God, depends upon Him or emanates from Him.

Consequently, the belief in the Amesha-spentas does not interfere with the monotheism of the Gâthic theology. In spite of all, Ahura Mazda stands out as the Almighty Being (*Yasna XXIX*, 3). It is He Who gives decision upon all, since everything happens according to His will (*Yasna XXIX*, 4). He is of one nature with them all, or, as the poet puts it: He dwells together with Asha and Vohu-manô (*Yasna XXXII*, 2; *XLIV*, 9), that is, He has these powers at His disposal; they stand at His command. They issue from Him, and go back unto Him. Ahura Mazda existed first of all. Khshathra and Ârmaiti, Vohu-manô and Asha are associated with Him as natural evolutions from His Being. Such powers only emanate from Him. He allots them unto men (*Yasna XXXI*, 21.) He stands far above them:—

"This I ask thee, give me the right answer, O Ahura!
Who hath created the blessed Ârmaiti together with Khshathra?
Who, through his wisdom, hath made the son in the image of the father?
I will designate thee, O Mazda! to the intelligent, as
The Creator of all, Thou Most Bountiful Spirit!"

(*Yasna XLIV*, 7).

Lastly, I have still to add a few words with reference to *Ashi* and *Sraosha*. How much the theology of the Gâthâs differs from that of the later Avesta is plainly manifested by these yazats. In the former *Ashi* can scarcely be considered the name of a genius as in the latter. The word has in the Gâthâs rather its original abstract signification: *reward*, or *recompense*; then *blessing*, or *success* (*Yasna XXVIII*, 4; *XLIII*, 1, 5, etc.). I cannot specify any Gâthic passage where *ashi* may be conceived with some probability as a proper name. The progress of the development of an abstract idea into the name of a *yazata*

is clearly perceptible as regards the word *ashi* in the period which intervenes between the epoch of the Gâthâs and the age of the later Avesta.

Similar is the case with *Sraosha*. In the later Avesta the word denotes throughout a genius of a pretty fixed and permanent nature with distinct individual characteristics. In a still later time he is described as the messenger of God, who has to convey His orders unto man. However, no such traits are observable in the Gâthâs. Here we discover only the first beginnings of the personification of the word in such passages as *Yasna* XXXIII, 5 where the poet invokes the "mighty Sraosha," and *Yasna* XLIV, 16 where the author implores the bestowal of a commander for protection against enemies, and wishes that "Sraosha with Vohumanô" may accompany him, in other words obedience to the holy religion and pious mind. In the latter passage, I believe a double sense is implied; but in other passages where *Sraosha* occurs it has the etymological abstract meaning of "obedience," "devotion"; or the concrete meaning of "the obedient," "the devoted," "the pious." The contrary expression *asrushti* hence signifies "the disobedient" in *Yasna* XXXIII, 4 and XLIV, 13.

We can now sum up the results of this chapter in a series of propositions as follows:—

(1) The theology of the Gâthâs is more abstract and philosophical than that of the later Avesta. It represents the oldest and most primitive form of the Mazdayasnian religion.

(2) The veneration of the more popular divinities such as *Mithra* and *Tishtrya*, is unknown to the poets of the Gâthâs. The cult of these *yazatas* was first adopted in a later epoch by a sort of compromise with the popular religion.

(3) The theology of the Gâthâs is monotheistic. Mazda Ahura is the Godhead *per se*.

(4) This monotheism is in no way interfered with by the genii alluded to in the Gâthâs, since these Amesha-spentas and *yazatas* are only hypostases of abstract conceptions, they are everywhere comprehended in their original import, and stand, moreover, in conformity with their nature under Mazda, being themselves regarded as His creatures.

CHAPTER V.

ZOROASTRIANISM IS NOT A DUALISTIC RELIGION.

The Zoroastrian religion has often been called a dualistic religion. This term we are, however, only then authorized to apply to it, when we understand under dualism a religious system wherein the existence of a power working in opposition to the good-creating and good-wishing Godhead, is also assumed besides Him. In this sense the Old Testament religion may, likewise, be denoted a dualistic system. Strictly speaking, we could only then point to a religion as a dualism when both the good and evil principles stand one against the other with equal rights, and are equally mighty; when both influence the world to an equal extent; and when man feels himself equally dependent upon and acted on by both of them. But where man can, by the power of his moral freedom of choice, decide upon goodness, and turn himself away from evil or vice, as is conspicuously often manifest in the Gâthas, the term "dualism" is no longer justified in my opinion. The existence of a dualism would, as I believe, require, among other things, that man should persevere in evincing the same veneration to the evil spirits as to the good spirits, that he should offer to the former sacrifices and prayers in order to propitiate them and to avert all sorts of mischief caused by them, as in (their) turn he offers them to the good spirits in order to share in their blessings. I need scarcely here emphasize that no traces of such ideas are found in the Avesta.

The Avesta, of course even in its oldest parts, recognizes an evil spirit, who in every point stands opposed to the good spirit. The assumption of his existence should be the solution of the question, which every philosophic mind will naturally dwell upon, as to how evil comes into the world, if the Deity is essentially good and can, accordingly, produce only good things. Whence originate crimes and sins; whence all the misery and imperfections, which cling unto man as well as to the whole creation? Zarathushtra and the other poets of the Gâthâs have endeavoured to solve that question in a philosophical way, and I will make an attempt, in the following pages, to expound briefly their system as it seems to unfold itself from the Gâthâs. I say "seems," because the Gâthâs have not at all in view the object of developing a system of philosophy. Their composers do not mean to address individuals from amongst the people, but the whole community; because they chiefly take into their consideration the practical side of religion, *viz.*, ethics, and not the philosophical form of its doctrine. We must, therefore, assay to construe from the brief indications and isolated passages of the hymns the ideas which may have presented themselves before the minds of these poets upon the question of evil. Naturally, these are distinct passages wherein the prophet is led by the context to speak of the nature of evil. But (in regard to this) we must at once renounce all claims to be able to represent clearly all the individual traits of the philosophical system which Zarathushtra may have established for himself. In reference also to the principal points, such as I shall attempt to

describe, opinions might frequently differ. Others will very easily find out certain passages, of which the meaning has not been sufficiently established by me, or which appear to be not quite consistent with my own views.

In the later Avesta, the opposition between the spirits of the good and the evil world is also carried through formally and most precisely. As Ahura Mazda stands at the head of the former, so Angra Mainyu stands at the head of the latter. As opponents of the six Amesha-spentas or archangels stand the six archdemons: *Akem-manô* is opposed to *Vohu-manô*; *Indra* or *Andra* to *Asha*; *Sauru* to *Khshathra*; the demon of arrogance, *Náoǰhailhyu*, to *Spenta-ârmaiti*; *Tauru* and *Zairicha* to *Haurvatât* and *Ameretât*. Then follows the army of the good spirits of light against the band of the *daevas* and *druj*.

In the Gâthâs the system, as it appears to me, is not so thoroughly developed. *Âgra Mainyu* occurs here only once as the name of the evil spirit, and of course in a single passage (*Yasna* XLV, 2) where *spanyâo mainyush* and not, as one would expect, Ahura Mazda, is mentioned as his opponent. Likewise, *akô mainyush* occurs only in one passage (*Yasna* XXXII, 5); *akem manô* is found twice named (*Yasna* XLVII, 5; XXXII, 3), which, however, has in other passages the original abstract sense of "evil mind," and *achishtem manô* also twice (*Yasna* XXX, 6; XXXII, 13), which is employed as an appellative of the evil principle.

Now at the first glance it might seem as though *âgra mainyush* and *akô mainyush* were formally the adversaries of *spenta mainyush*, and *akem manô* and *achishtem manô* of *vohu manô* and *vahishtem manô*. However, such is not the case in the Gâthâs. All these names evidently denote, without any distinction, the evil spirit who is called simply *Âgra Mainyu* in the later Avesta. Thus, for example, in *Yasna* XXXII, 3, the *daevas* are designated as the brood (*cithra*) of *Akemmanô* who must be, in such a context, manifestly the highest and the head of the world of evil spirits. The same is probably the value of *Achishtem-manô*, when it is said in *Yasna* XXX, 6, that the demons flock together around him, while the good spirits are associated with, or collect around, *Spenta Mainyu* (*Yasna* XXX, 7, and comp. 5). Nay, it even appears that in the same passage *Aeshma*, too, which is otherwise the name of a particular demon, serves only as the appellative of *Âgra Mainyu*.

Now as regards the exposition of the relations in which the good spirits stand to the evil spirits, it is important to note that there is no regular counterpart principally of the name Ahura Mazda. The names which serve as designations of the evil spirit, stand rather as counterparts of the name *Spenta-mainyu* or *Vohu-manô*. But where both the good and evil spirits are named together (*Yasna* XXX, 4-7; XLV, 2), the good spirit is not denoted by Mazda, but *Spenta-(spanyâo, spenishta) mainyu*. The essential function of *Spenta-mainyu* himself does not even seem fully clear in the Gâthâs. He is sometimes identified with Ahura Mazda (*Yasna* XLIII, 2), sometimes he is distinguished from Him (*Yasna* XLV, 6; XLVII, 1); he must hence be a divine being who

sometimes rises to the level of the Highest Godhead : sometimes he is distinct from Him, and leads a separate existence.

If we were to compare all these data we should be able to characterize the philosophy of Zarathushtra approximately as follows :—The Highest Being, the Godhead, is plainly Ahura Mazda. He is by nature good, and only goodness emanates from Him. Evil is the negation of goodness ; it exists only in relation to the latter, just as darkness is only the negation of light. Now so far as Ahura Mazda is the positive, to whom evil forms the negative, He is called Spenta-mainyu, while evil or its personification is Agra-mainyu or Akô-mainyu. Both Spenta-mainyu and Akô-mainyu are hence represented as twins (*Yasna* XXX, 3) ; they do not exist alone for themselves, but each in relation to the other ; both are absorbed in the higher Unity, Ahura Mazda. They existed before the beginning of the world ; their opposition is exhibited in the visible world. Ahura Mazda is the Creator of the universe, but as He, in the form of Spenta-mainyu, creates anything, the negative counterpart of Him is given, *i.e.*, as the poet expresses it in a popular form, Agra-mainyu, the evil spirit, who produces evil in opposition to goodness (*Yasna* XXX, 4 *seq.*). The first thing which the twins produced, is life or death, or, as it may perhaps be philosophically expressed, the being and not being, wherein the double side of their nature is marked. Thus, if Spenta-mainyu creates light, the darkness, or the not being, or the absence of light, is the contrary creation of Agra-mainyu ; if the former gives warmth, the negation of warmth, *viz.*, cold, originates from the latter. All evil is, consequently, to the Zoroastrian not something properly realistic, existing in and for itself, but only the failure of goodness. Therefore, it is self-evident that good and evil throughout are not parallel ideas of equal value, but the latter has a purely relative existence. If we admit this, we must also assert that Zoroastrianism cannot be called a dualism in the proper sense of the term.

Now, as soon as we ask the question : How does man stand in relation to these two opposite principles ? we thereby directly touch upon the sphere of ethics. But when we interrogate : What is the final end (at the last judgment) of this opposition between good and evil ? we come therewith to the subject of eschatology, the doctrine of the last things, the end of the world and the last judgment. Both ethics and eschatology are specially weighty points of the Zoroastrian religion. Both naturally stand in a close reciprocal relation. So early as in the Gâthâs we discover numerous and important hints upon ethics and eschatology.

It is a well-known fact that the entire system of Zoroastrian ethics is based upon the triad of "good thoughts, good words, and good actions," the *humata, hūkhta, and hvarshta*. This, indeed, presupposes a high standard of moral culture, when the sin in thought is placed on the same level with the sin in action, and, therefore, the root of all actions as well as the measure of every moral discernment is perceived in the mind. *We must hence aver that the founders of the Avesta religion at least attained to that stage in ethics to which*

only the best parts of the Old Testament rise, and that they display an inclination towards that depth of moral intuition which is perceptible in Christianity.

Now, we must emphasize this fact that at a very early period the Gâthâs knew about this ethical triad which also sways over the entire later Avesta. There is no doubt, therefore, that the foundation of this ethical system had been laid by Zarathushtra himself. The character of these ethics is thus in fact so personal and individual that we are involuntarily forced to assume that it is the product of an individual supereminent spirit which, endowed with special moral gifts of nature, has attained to such a keenness and preciseness in the conception of the moral laws. That this doctrine developed out of a whole nation, so that it was to a certain extent the property of a community, and gradually took the form in which it is represented in the extant Avesta, seems to me quite incredible.

The poet says in *Yasna* XXX, 3, that the two spirits that had existed from the beginning, the twins, had announced to him in a vision what is good and what is evil in thoughts, words, and actions. In like manner, *Yasna* LI, 21 designates piety as the fruit of the thoughts, words, and deeds of an humble mind. On the contrary, evil thoughts, evil words, and evil works, emanate from the wicked spirit (*Yasna* XXXII, 5). In the service of God this ethical tripartition is manifested in the devout feeling which the adorer shall foster in the good speech which he utters, and in the offering ceremony which he performs. But it would be only a limitation which is not vindicated by the Avesta texts, were we to regard this triple moral idea exclusively as ritual expressions. That the mind or thought settles the fundamental tone of this moral triad, so that speech and actions must be dependent upon it, and judged according to it, is clearly enough declared by the prophet when he speaks of the words and deeds of a good mind (*Yasna* XLV, 8).

Now as to the position of man in relation to good and evil, the most conspicuous point in the ethics of the Gâthâs is the complete free choice which belongs to every individual. According to the Zoroastrian standpoint, no man stands under any ban whatever of destiny, of a destiny originating from eternity, which binds him and oppresses his will. There is here no original sin for which he has to suffer as the result of the faults of his parents, and which cripples his strength in struggling against evil. The evil lies not in him but out of him. He can let evil approach him and admit it in himself, but at the same time he can keep it off from himself, and struggle with it.

This is certainly a sound moral standpoint which places all responsibility upon man himself, and deprives him of the possibility of making any excuse for his laxity by saying that the matter did not lie in his power (or was a result of destiny).

That the determination in favour of good or evil is a matter of free choice, is typically signified by the fact that the demons, too place themselves out of a peculiar motive, on the side of the evil Spirit. They are, therefore, not evil

by nature, but they become so by foolishly declaring themselves in opposition to Ahura Mazda (*Yasna* XXX, 6). Nay, it is even a free voluntary act of the Evil Spirit himself that he chose sin as his sphere of action, while Spentamainyu made the choice of piety and truth for himself (*Yasna* XXX, 5). And, likewise, it is only the pious and faithful who make the right choice of the good thoughts, good words, and good deeds ; but not the impious (*Yasna* XXX, 3).

This doctrine of the free volition of man conforms with the opinion already expressed by me above that religion is a matter of understanding or judgment, and that righteousness and truth on the one hand, and impiety and falsehood on the other hand, naturally stand in the closest connection. According to the Zoroastrian idea, moreover, man is not fettered with a blind fate, nor prejudiced in his judgment by hereditary sins. God has given him his power of judgment, and he who has ears may hear, and he who has intellect may choose, what is right and true. The sinner is a fool, and the fool a sinner.

The Zoroastrian well understands how great the danger is for each individual, and in how many different ways evil manifests itself in the visible world and threatens to cause the downfall of the pious. His life is, therefore, a constant and indefatigable struggle or combat against evil. It would be superfluous here to cite all the Gâthic passages which touch upon this earnest conception of life as an everlasting combat in the fulfilment of the true obligations. The exhortation that every one shall persevere in righteousness and devotion and shall not get tired of it, forms rightly and precisely the fundamental tone of most of the Gâthic hymns.

Piety is the most ardent wish of the poet (*Yasna* XXXII, 9). He implores Ârmaiti that she may let him firmly adhere to the faith (*asha*), and that she may grant him the blessing of a pious mind (*Yasna* XLIII, 1). The faith is the highest goodness (*vahishtem*) which he can acquire from God. He implores the Deity to obtain this highest good for himself as well as for his adherent Frash-aoshtra (*Yasna* XXVIII, 9). The highest goodness is the property of Mazda. From Him it reaches unto men when the Holy Word is announced to them (*Yasna* XXXI, 6 ; XLV, 4). In this respect the Gâthic hymns stand far higher than those of the Rigveda. In the Gâthâs the gifts or possessions which the poet longs for, are almost exclusively spiritual and moral ones ; it is only in isolated cases that material gifts form the object of his wish. The Vedic singers, on the contrary, pray for horses and cattle and splendid riches.

The absence of cult and ceremonies is a conspicuous feature of the Gâthâs when contrasted with the later Avesta. In the latter, regularly recurring prayers, offerings, recitations, and purifications, which are undergone daily or at certain occasions, play an important part ; they form the very contents of the *Vendidad*, the religious code of the Zoroastrians. The guardians of these numerous precepts are the priests, who have to watch over their fulfilment, and to impose the due penance upon the negligent and tardy people who transgress them. The whole life of the Zoroastrian is governed by these precepts of purification and their minute observances. But if we glance at the Gâthâs,

we discover no trace of all these precepts and customs. The reason of the absence of any such trace may be explained in two ways. Either we may assume that the context in the Gâthâs, the tendency and object which their authors pursued, generally offered no occasion to speak of any ritual and ceremony ; or we may account for his phenomenon by supposing that in the epoch wherein the Gâthâs were composed, generally speaking no such detail of precepts had existed ; but that the whole system gradually developed to perfection when the community became more and more established, and the new doctrine found wider and wider extension. I believe that we should feel no hesitation in following the latter explanation. The Gâthâs are, indeed, not completely silent as regards the external forms of the divine worship. They allude to the hymns of praise whereby the Deity is adored by man (*Yasna* XXXIV, 6 ; XLV, 6, 8 ; L. 4). According to *Yasna* XLV, 10, Ahura Mazda is exalted by offerings ; and they are the deeds of the good mind whereby one approaches God (*Yasna*, L, 9), and propitiates the holy spirits (*Yasna* XXXIV, 1). But these are quite general ideas. The ethics of the Gâthâs are in such a high degree internal or mental ; they recognize so decidedly or precisely the piety in a holy course of life and in an energetic struggle against evil, that the idea seems to be hardly compatible with the belief that a reward can be gained by the conscientious observance of external ceremonies at any time. The expression which denotes in the later Avesta the fulfilment of the precepts of purification, is *yaozhdâo*, which occurs only once in the Gâthâs (*Yasna* XLVIII, 5). The Gâthâs do not mention even once a common name for the priesthood. They, of course, refer to the whole community of the believers, and particularly, as it seems, to the teachers and proclaimers of the new religion, by a distinct word *saoshyantô*. This word, however, bears quite a different meaning in the later Avesta, in which the priest is denoted by *dâthravan*, an expression which is entirely wanting in the Gâthâs. Without the existence of a priestly institution, however, the observance and management of a ritual entering so much into minute details, just as the Vendidad teaches, is inconceivable. The absence of any reference to the priesthood as well as to a well-organized system of ritual and ceremonies can be quite easily explained by the general condition of civilization such as is described in the Gâthâs. Herein the Zoroastrian community is represented as a rising generation, the doctrine is still a new one, not long known to the people, nor spread among them. However, those two phenomena, *viz.*, priesthood formed as a separate institution, and a developed system of religious usages and precepts, come into existence only under settled circumstances. They presuppose a certain tradition, a longer period of development in which it became possible to place the system on a firm footing not merely as regards its general characteristic principles, but also its finish in details. The principal traits of Zoroastrianism are, nevertheless, presented in the Gâthâs, its detailed outward structure being found in the later Avesta. There seems to be no doubt that this outward structure certainly corresponds in all points to the spirit which permeates the Gâthâs.

As we have already observed, the Gâthâs did originate in an epoch of ardent conflict. Very often we find the believers in need and distress, while the godless and disbelievers in the doctrine rejoice and seem to claim the victory in the fight. When the thought naturally occurs:—How are the righteous indemnified for the wrong which they endure here on earth, and how are the impious who appear to enjoy good luck and success, punished for their crimes? Hence, in the earliest period of Zoroastrianism the conception of a compensating justice meted out in the next world, was already strong. It formed one of the ground-pillars of the entire system; for without this hope the faithful adherents of the doctrine would scarcely have overcome triumphantly all the persecutions which they must have suffered at the beginning. Like the Christian martyrs of the first century, they forbore all the affliction of this world in the hope of the joy and happiness which awaited them in the next world (*Yasna* XLV, 7):—

“When they will receive the reward of their deeds,
Those who are living now, those who have lived, and those who will live;
Then the soul of the pious will be happy in eternity,
But never will end the torments of the disbeliever;
Thus Mazda hath established according to His power.”

Thus merit and fate are adjusted in a divine court of justice. This judgment is twofold, one individual, and the other general. The individual judgment is administered to every individual soul after its separation from the body; the general judgment, on the contrary, to the whole body of the souls at the end of the world, *viz.*, the doom's day. With the latter follow, as it would seem, the perfect separation of the wicked from the good, and the abolition of the negative after which the positive, realistic, and the good alone will survive.

So far as we can conclude from the indications in the Gâthâs regarding the fate of the souls after their separation from the body, the ideas of this epoch correspond to those of the later Avesta. The judgment takes place at the Chinvat Bridge which connects this world with the next. The pious soul crosses this bridge in communion with the souls of all those who have zealously striven for the good on earth (*Yasna* XLVI, 10). It now enters into the “spiritual world” which in the Gâthâs is often contrasted with the visible and corporeal world (*Yasna* XXVIII, 3). Yonder it shares in the highest beatitude, which consists principally in the soul beholding Mazda and the heavenly spirits face to face, and dwelling with them together in Eternal Light. “O Asha, when shall I see Thee,” asks the poet in *Yasna* XXVIII, “and Vohu-manô, the possessor of knowledge, and the abode which belongs to Ahura in particular?” To the great discomfort of the evil souls, the righteous souls will be conducted in the future to the abode of the Blissful Spirit, according to *Yasna* XXXII, 15. Whosoever has overcome lying and deceit by dint of truth, will receive from Mazda the heavenly kingdom and the eternal bliss (*Yasna* XXX, 8); and whosoever has adhered firmly to the *Vêh-Dîn* “Good Religion,” will enter unhindered the dwelling of Vohu-manô, Asha, and Mazda (*Yasna*

XXX, 10). God will bestow eternal life upon those who follow Zarathushtra (*Yasna* XLVI, 13), and this life is a life of bliss, for the *Garôdemâna*, "the Abode of Hymns," is called in *Yasna* XLV, 8 the paradise in which the pious dwell.

Further, we observe that the Gâthâs, consistently with their entire character, consider the blissfulness in the next world as an essentially spiritual one, just as in the Christian religion it rests in the "beholding of God" (*schaauen Gottes*), in the close communion with the Godhead. We hardly find any such traces among the Indians. Here Zoroastrianism exhibits a strong opposition to the natural religions, which conceive the life after death as a continuation of the future life with all its joys, advantages, and habits; but without its sufferings and painfulness.

While the soul of the righteous joyfully crosses the Chinvat Bridge, which leads him to the Kingdom of Heaven, the soul of the sinful is stricken with fear and terror, in the presentiment of the penal retribution awaiting him (*Yasna* LI, 13). The Divine Judgment exiles the soul into Hell. Just as the Kingdom of Heaven is pure light, so is darkness the abode of the demons (*Yasna* XXXII, 10, *achishtahyâ demânê mananghô* "in the abode of the evil spirit," is the formal and real antithesis to the *vanghêush â demânê mananghô* in strophe 15). It is in the abode of the demons that the sinful soul is received by the evil spirits with scoffing and disgrace, and entertained with loathsome food (*Yasna* XLIX, 11). But as pure spiritual joys make up the essential constituent of Paradise, so there are, likewise, essential spiritual torments under which the soul of the wicked has to pine after his death. Such a soul is severed from Mazda and the blessed spirits; it dwells with the demons in eternity; it is particularly tormented by its own conscience which accuses it and condemns it (*Yasna* XLVI, 11). Thus tranquillity and serene joyfulness are for the blessed on the one side, and trouble and remorse and repentance for the damned on the other. Such is the compensation in the next world for the disproportion between reward and punishment which we so often perceive in the life of man here on earth.

Such a recompense or retribution is allotted to each individual immediately after death. The material work, however, is not destined to last for ever. It will in the future be annihilated. Thus the final judgment is united with the end of the world. Already in the Gâthâs this idea (of the next world) is clearly observable. The general judgment does not stand in contradiction to the individual judgment. The latter finds its solemn confirmation in the former, and we may probably assume that at the final judgment evil will be annihilated and banished from the world. The Gâthâs, nevertheless, do not speak definitely upon this subject, but the later Avesta contains this doctrine, and we daresay that without it the notion of a judgment at the end of the world would be almost without any object. In the hymns the final judgment is apparently not quite distinguished from the individual judgment. Mazda Who existed

from the beginning of the world has laid it down that in His power evil shall be the retribution of the evil, and good the reward of the good at the end of the world. The pious will enter the heavenly kingdom of Mazda at the end of the world (*Yasna* XLIII, 5-6 ; LI, 6), that is, he will outlast the destruction which evil and the evil people will be subject to.

CONCLUSION.

I now come to the end of my survey. It appeared to me indeed adapted to the spirit of the age, and worth my while to point at once to the Gâthâs as the oldest parts of the Avesta, and to treat the contents of their doctrine separately. The task itself may furnish us with the proof that such a treatment of the subject is practicable. It may prove at the same time to be a contribution to the argument that a deep cleft separates the Gâthâs from the other books of the Avesta, and that the Parsees have been led rightly and by important grounds to ascribe already in an early period a special sanctity to these old hymns. My task appeared to me the more useful as in the Gâthâs a particularly original and antique form of the Zoroastrian doctrine can be discovered ; and this form is the purest and sublimest that we know of. It is still free from many later additions, and permits us to observe in a favourable light the personality of Zarathushtra, his moral earnest and yet human intentions, and his philosophical system which ventures to solve the highest and most important problem in religious philosophy. We recognize in Zarathushtra a man who was far in advance of his times, who proclaimed already in a remote antiquity a monotheistic religion to the people, who conceived from a philosophical standpoint the Being of the Godhead, the relation in which man stands to Him, and the origin of evil ; and who perceived the chief point not in offerings and external ceremonies, but in a pious mind, and in a life conforming to such a pious mind.

This discourse is addressed to the Parsees of India on the one hand, and to those amongst Europeans on the other who take a warm interest in India and its inhabitants. It will bring before them the oldest and to a certain extent the ideal form of the doctrine, as it was thought out and conceived principally by its founder and author himself. It will at the same time enable also the European who is himself not in a position to study the original texts of the Sacred Writings of the Parsees, to form a correct estimate and to give an unbiased criticism of the Parsee religion and its moral standard. *May it prove a foundation stone in the Bridge which will unite the West and the East with one another.*

VIEWS OF THE CLASSICAL WRITERS REGARDING ZOROASTER AND HIS DOCTRINE.*

The earliest contact between Græcism and Magism that we are informed of, is an intercourse between Pythagoras and the Magi, which lasted for several years. Whilst ancient and modern writers vary as to the year of the birth of this sage, and place it at one time in 608 or 605, at another in 570 B.C.; so much is, however, certain that the years of his active life fall under the reign of Cyrus, and that he left his native country before the death of the founder of the Persian Monarchy, in order to make scientific travels. If the statements of the chroniclers¹ were true, according to which Pythagoras is said to have served in the army of Assarhaddon, he might have had, already in his earliest youth, an opportunity of conversing with the Magi; but that is evidently an anachronism. Others,² on the contrary, relate that the campaign of Cambyses in Egypt took place during his sojourn in that country; Pythagoras may have there been taken prisoner and brought with the Persian army to Babylon, where he may have had intercourse with the Chaldæans and the Magi for twelve years; hence he may have returned at the age of 56 to Samos. The campaign of Cambyses in Egypt falls in the Olympiad 63,4 (525 B.C.), and his death in Olympiad 64,4 (521 B.C.). During this interval, therefore, Pythagoras must have come to Babylon, where he remained until B.C. 513. That Pythagoras had been in Egypt is affirmed by Herodotus and Isocrates; but that a man so curious in religious matters should visit also Babylon, the metropolis of Asiatic knowledge, and should make acquaintance with the Chaldæans and the Magi, is a fact so very evident in itself, that I cannot conceive how the very numerous statements of antiquity could be rejected for no other reason than their being found in writers of a later period.³

* Translated from the German of Dr. Fr. Windischmann's *Zoroastrische Studien*, a posthumous German work edited by F. von Spiegel, Berlin. Chapter on—*Stellen der Alten über Zoroastrisches* "References in Ancient Writings to Zoroaster and his Doctrine."

¹ *Chronie Eusebii*, edited by Aucher of Abydenus, p. 26. *Comp. M. Niebuhr, Assur* p. 497 and 501; B. G. Niebuhr, *Kl. Schriften*, p. 206.

² *Theolog. Arithmet.*, ed., Ast. p. 40 :—"He is said to have been made prisoner by Cambyses, when he went to Egypt, and to have had intercourse with the priest; he came into Babylon and learnt the rites of the barbarians." Jamblichus, in his "Life of Pythagoras," p. 19, narrates the same facts, and adds :—"There he liked to converse with the Magi, and learned their signs and the most perfect mode of serving the gods, and became accomplished in a high degree in the numbers, music, and other sciences. He stayed there for another 12 years and went afterwards to Samos, when he was about 56 years of age."

³ Cicero *de fin.*, V, 29 :—"Pythagoras had visited Egypt and conversed with the Persian Magi." Valerius Maximus VIII, 7 extern, 2 :—"Thence he went to the Persians and was taught the very exact wisdom of the Magi." Plinius, *Hist. Naturalis*, XXX, 12 :—"At least Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus and Plato sailed off to learn this art (of magic), really undertaking rather exile than travel." Apuleius, *Floridus*, p. 19 ed. Altib. :—"There are writers who say that Pythagoras had been taught by the Persian Magi" (*comp. infra* the whole passage). Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, I., p. 355 :—"He conversed with the best of the Chaldæans and Magi." Diogenes Laertes, VIII, 13 :—

But in making use of these statements it is very important to observe that the majority of the authors distinguish between the Chaldæans and the Magi. Porphyrius¹ says in his *Life of Pythagoras* :—" He has inculcated truth before all things ; this alone can render man God-like, since also in God (called by the Magi Oromazes) the body, as he learnt from them, resembles light, whilst the soul is like unto truth." And further on :—" He heard and accepted from the Magi the worship of the divinities and the other precepts of life." What is related here by Porphyrius about the Magi, is taken from pre-eminent sources. If we do not regard the high veneration of the Persians and the Magi for truth, a fact often confirmed elsewhere, the distinction of a body and a soul in God is truly Zarathushtrian. In the *Farvardin Yasht*, §§ 80 to 81, it is said of Ahura Mazda :—" His genius is the most intelligent and the best-bodied ; His soul is *Mâthrâ-Spenta* (the Holy Word), the bright, the shining, the foreseeing, and the bodies which He assumes, are the fine bodies of the *Amesha-Spentas* (' the Blissful Immortal '), the solid ones of the Amesha-Spentas, let us venerate the strong horsed Sun."

The Holy Word is the very truth, and the Amesha-Spentas are the luminous creations, wherefore it is significant that the Sun is invoked immediately after them. Moreover, we are justified in thinking of Mithra as morally truth and physically light, and as a being who may be regarded as a likeness of Ahura. In the *Hormazd Yasht*, § 21 (*see Yasht Fr. II, § 38*) are mentioned the spirit, the intellect and the tongue of Ahura as bearing, remembering and uttering the Holy Word, and in several passages the body of Ahura is mentioned along with His intellectual spirit (*comp. Yasna I, § 1*) *khrathwishtahê hukereptemahê*. *Yasna LXXI, § 4*, speaks of *vîspem kerfsh Ahurahê*, " the whole body of Ahura." The beginning of the *Bundahish*, too, completely harmonizes with the passage of Porphyrius.

On the other hand, the same authority² relates other facts about the intercourse of Pythagoras and the Chaldæans :—" He had intercourse not only with the other Chaldæans, but also with Zabratas, by whom he was purified

"Having been still young and curious, he left his native country, and learnt all the rites of the Greeks and barbarians. He was in Egypt when Polycrates recommended him by letters to Amasis. He learned their language, as is stated by Antiphon in his book on those men who excelled in virtue, and afterwards he went to the Magi and Chaldæans." That Pythagoras himself had been in Persia or even in India, must be an exaggeration—a mistake resulting from his intercourse with the Magi.

¹ *Vita Pyth.* "Life of Pythagoras," 41 :—" He gave these precepts ; but before all he taught to speak the truth. For this alone can render man like unto God, since, as he learnt from the Magi, in God too, Who is called by them Oromazes, the body is like unto light, and the soul unto truth." And in chapter 7 :—" As to the divine ceremonies and other things referring to the affairs of life, he is said to have been taught and instructed by the Magi."

² "Life of Pythagoras," 12 :—" But in Babylon he had intercourse with other Chaldæans as well as with Zabratas, by whom he was purified from the transgressions of his former life, and instructed as to what the zealous must chiefly abstain from. He learnt there also his (Zabratas's) doctrine about nature and the first principles of the universe."

from the sins of his earlier life, and was taught how zealous people must keep themselves pure ; there he had also heard the doctrine of the nature and the first principles of the universe." What Porphyrius here states, seems to have been taken from Aristoxenus (about 320 B.C.), of whose writings a very large fragment has been preserved by Hippolytus (*Refut. Haeret* "Refutation of the Heretics," p. 8, Oxford edition. Cfr. Origenes, edition of Lammazsch, volume XXV, page 296 *seq.*; Diodorous the Eretrian is also named as an authority). Aristoxenus narrates that Zaratas set forth his doctrine to Pythagoras :—"There have been from the beginning two causes (or principles) of things, father and mother. The light is the father, the darkness is the mother ; the parts of light are the warm, the dry, the light and the swift ; but the parts of darkness are the cold, the wet, the heavy and the slow ; of all these is composed the world of male and female. But the world is a musical harmony, wherefore the sun has a harmonical circulation." Yet concerning the things that originate from the earth and the world, Zaratas gave an explanation, says Aristoxenus, in the following manner :—"There are two demons, a celestial and a terrestrial one ; the latter takes his origin from the earth, and is water ; but the celestial one is fire coupled with air, warm and cold." Then follows the reason why beans¹ should not be eaten on account of the bean having some reference to sexuality. In another passage, too, Hippolytus mentions Zaratas (B. 178) where he says :—"Zaratas, the teacher of Pythagoras, has called the first one father, the second one mother." Thus Plutarch also relates.²

It is clear that this doctrine of Zabratas or Zaratas, the Chaldæan, as described by Aristoxenus and Porphyrius,³ does not contain anything that is specifically Zarathushtrian ; but that, on the contrary, it is directly opposed to the system of the Magi in very important points. It is, therefore, not without meaning that Porphyrius distinguishes the doctrine of the Magi from that of the Chaldæans, and explicitly calls Zabratas, a Chaldæan, whilst Jamblichus evidently confounds the two doctrines in the passage cited above ("Life of Pythagoras," 19). The same correct distinction between the Magi and the Chaldæans, Zoroaster and Zaratas, is found also in Clements of Alexandria, as well as in the passage already referred to, and also in *Stromata*, I, page 357, Potter's edition,⁴ where he explicitly calls Zaratas, an Assyrian, whilst he says

¹ It is very remarkable that the prohibition of bean-eating, which Pythagoras is said to have learnt from the Chaldæan Zaratas, is found in the Old Babylonian or Chaldæan documents. *Comp. Chwolson*, "The Remains of the Old Babylonian Literature," p. 93 *seq.*

² *De animæ procreatione*, in *Timæo*, chapter 11, 2, "Zaratas, the teacher of Pythagoras, calls this (*i.e.*, the *duûda* "the Two") the mother of numbers, and the One he calls father."

³ Of course we must not imagine that the later writers have authentically made out the contents of the doctrine of Pythagoras. It is sufficient to state that they knew the difference between the Magian and the Chaldæan.

⁴ "But Alexander, in his work on the Pythagorean creed, narrates that Pythagoras learnt from the Assyrian Nazaratas. Some fancy that this was Ezekiel (a prophet of the Old Testament) : yet it is not so, as will soon be demonstrated." The commentators of Clements have long since observed that we must read Zaratas instead of Nazaratas. The

a few lines above¹ :—"Pythagoras emulated Zoroaster, the Magian and Persian, whose secret writings the followers of the gnostic Prodikos boasted to possess," by which must be understood the later gnostic productions under the name of Zoroaster. It is self-evident that "emulating" does not express any personal intercourse between Pythagoras and Zoroaster.

It is consequently to be ascribed to want of accuracy, if Suidas² speaks of some Magian Zaras, who was the teacher of Pythagoras, or if Plinius³ names some Median Zaratas. On the contrary, we must assume that Zaratas, the Chaldæan or the Assyrian, is a person quite different from Zoroaster, and that his name is Semitic, perhaps similar to Zaret (or Zereth) in 1. *Chronicles*, IV. 7. Nothing is proved by the fact that some later writers, e.g., Agathias and Photius (see below), call Zoroaster also *Zarades* or *Zarades*; for, firstly, this form of the name is not identical with Zaratas, and, secondly, some confusion, of the different personalities may have taken place.⁴

So the disagreeable eulogist Apuleius⁵ stands quite alone in calling Zoroaster, the teacher of Pythagoras. Better informed writers knew too well that such a personal intercourse between Zoroaster and Pythagoras was impossible.

This is, therefore, the result of my investigation. It is very probable that Pythagoras came to Babylon, and that he had there come in contact not only with Chaldæans and their sage Zaratas, but also with the Magi properly so

above-mentioned Alexander is Alexander Polyhistor, as *Cyrillus adv. Julianum* asserts:—"Alexander, surnamed Polyhistor, (*lit.* "a man of great learning") in his book on the Pythagorean creed, states that Pythagoras learnt from one Zaras, a native of Babylonia."

¹ "Pythagoras emulated Zoroaster, the Magian and Persian, whose apocryphal writings those who followed the doctrine of Prodikos, boast that they possess." That we must read *ezelōsen* "he emulated" instead of *edlōsen* "he announced," is confirmed by an imitation in *Cyrillus adv. Jul.*, III, p. 87, where Pythagoras is called "the best emulator" of Zoroaster. It is true that *zēlōtēs* is also employed in the sense of "a true disciple;" comp. *Hermippus* in Diogenes Laertes, VIII, 56. On the contrary, in Strabo, XVI, p. 762, Lycurgus is called *zēlōtēs* of Minos.

² *Sub voce* Pythagoras:—"This man heard . . . Zaratas the Magian." *Scholias* to Plato's *Republic*, X, p. 600 B, have the reading *Zaratas*.

³ *Historia Naturalis*, XXX, 1, 2:—"How many are there who know the very names of the Medians, Apusorus and Zaratas, and the Babylonians, Marmarus and Arabantiphocus or the Assyrian Tarmoenda, of whom there remain no documents?"

⁴ See Cotelier, *ad Recogn. Clem.*, IV, 27, and the anathema pronounced there against the Manichæans, wherein it is said:—"I anathematize Zarades, who, Mani says, had flourished before him among the Indians and Persians, and whom he called Helios, the Sun; with him I anathematize the prayers which are called Zaradian prayers; and further below they are cursed who identify themselves with Zarades, Buddha, Christ, Manes and the Sun."

⁵ *Floridus*, p. 19, ed. Altib:—"There are authors who say that when Pythagoras was brought among the prisoners of King Cambyses into Egypt, he had at that time as teachers Persian Magi and specially Zoroaster, who was initiated into all divine mysteries. A more reliable statement, on the contrary, is that he had sought voluntarily to learn the Egyptian mysteries, and that he had learnt in Egypt from the priest the incredible powers of ceremonies, the admirable sets of numbers, the ingenious formulæ of geometry; but he had not been satisfied with these arts; so he had soon turned to the Chaldæans and thence to the Brahmans (they are wise men, a tribe of India) and to the gymnosophists (*i.e.*, the sages that lived naked in India)."

called, and became acquainted with the Zarathushtrian doctrine; but no documental authority asserts that he had formed a personal acquaintance with Zoroaster, and it is a mere mistake of the moderns to confound Zaratas with Zoroaster. If Pythagoras came to Babylon at the latest under Cambyses (for those who antedate the year of his birth must likewise antedate his travels back to the beginning of the Persian Empire under Cyrus), it follows, hence, that the Zarathushtrian Reform was not an institution which had just originated, for the authorities do not say a word about it, but only place the wisdom of the Magi, emulated by Pythagoras, directly on a level with the Egyptian and Chaldaean sciences renowned in antiquity. And if we might concede that the whole account of the acquaintance of Pythagoras with the Zarathushtrian system is a later amplification of his travels (though indeed it is already met with in Aristoxenus), still these amplificators have supposed it as historically certain, that the Zarathushtrian Magism had existed long before the period of when Pythagoras was still in his prime of life, and thus they consequently bear indirect testimony to the existence of Zarathushtra long before the father of Darius.

The fact that Pythagoras became acquainted with the Magi at Babylon, and that there existed, no doubt, Zarathushtrian schools in this capital in consequence of the Persian conquest, induced the later writers to directly call Zoroaster and Ostanès, Babylonians. Thus the author of *Theologumena Arithmetica* (page 43, ed. Ast.), says that Ostanès and Zoroaster, the most highly esteemed Babylonians, called the starry spheres *agêlas* (herds), or in their holy sayings *agêlous*, or, corrupted by the interpolation of a *g*, *aggêlous* "angels," for which reason they called also the stars and demons reigning over these *aggeloi*, angels and archangels, who were seven in number. This may be some transference from the Chaldaean to Zoroaster; yet similar conceptions concerning the chief stars are also met with in the Bundahish, Chapter V.

It is almost impracticable to determine whether there is anything Zarathushtrian, and, if so, what in the doctrines of Pythagoras, since what Pythagoras had taught himself and what his later disciples added, is quite obscure. Among the Pythagorean "beliefs" there are some which remind us of the Zarathushtrian doctrine, for instance: "Not to make water towards the Sun" (which is known also to Hesiod); "not to make water towards, not to stand upon cut-off finger nails." However, we need not attach any particular importance to it.

Here I may add what is related about the travels of Democritus (who was born about 460 B.C. and died 104 years old, in B.C. 357). He wandered about, according to his own testimony, until his eightieth year, and saw the greatest portion of the known world, and had intercourse with a large number of men (*vide* his *Fragmenta* in Clements Alexandrinus, *Stromata* I., p. 304). So there cannot be the least doubt as to the truth of what Elianus¹ affirms:—"He had

¹ *Var. Hist.* IV, 20:—"Thon he came to the Chaldeans and to Babylon, and to the Magi and to the sages, of India." Suidas s.v. *Democritus*:—"According to some writers (he was) a disciple of Anaxagoras and Lencippus; according to others also of the Magi, Chaldeans and Persians. Clem. Alex, *Stromata*. I., p. 357, ed. by Potter:—"He came

got to the Chaldeans and to Babylon, and to the Magi and to the sages of India." The time in which Democritus had intercourse with the Magi, falls under the reign of Artaxerxes I. Tatianus¹ says that he praised Ostanès the Magus. It might be supposed that the travels of Pythagoras were fabricated in imitation of the indisputable migrations of Democritus; but with equal right we may also assume that Democritus had been induced by that very example of Pythagoras to search after the wisdom of all nations at its source. In general we have very little idea of the closeness of intercourse existing in earlier times between the Orient and the Occident, and, therefore, we can calculate little upon the active intermediaries between both, i.e., the Greeks of Asia Minor. But when, in consequence of the Persian wars, and still more of the conquests of Alexander the Great, more abundant and more faithful news referring to Persian affairs came across to Europe, the attention of learned Greeks was more and more drawn also to Zarathushtra and his system.

The earliest Greek writer who mentions Zoroaster, is Xanthus the Lydian, granting that the latter's age and authorship are accepted as fully established. For there are well-founded reasons to doubt especially the time in which Xanthus is said to have lived. As in his book a fact which happened under Artaxerxes I, is recounted,² we are to believe that he must have written it at least after Olympiad 78, 4 or 79, 1 (B.C. 465). If he was, as Suidas relates, *gegonòs epi tes haloseos Sardeon* "born at the time when Sardis was conquered," and if the conquest of Sardis took place under Croesus, B.C. 546, and if by the word *gegonòs* is meant his "birth" (Olympiad 58, 3),³ he must have been 80 years old just twenty Olympiads after, which is not at all impossible. But as Sardis was also taken under Darius Hystaspes in Olympiad 70, 2 (B.C. 499) by the Ionians and Athenians, we have from that time to Olympiad 70, 2 only an interval of 35 years. Here we have to choose whether we should take *gegonòs* in the sense of "born," in which case Xanthus at the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes might not yet have attained 40 years; or in the sense of "flourishing," in which case he must have been about 30 years old at the time of the said conquest of Sardis, his birth in which city should be placed in B.C. 529, so that he must have been 64 years old during the reign of Artaxerxes, which is not improbable. The testimony of Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁴ respecting Xanthus, that "he is one of those historians who were born some time before the Peloponnesian wars and lived to the era of Thucydides," might render it possible to regard the conquest of Sardis (Olympiad 70, 2) as

to Babylon, Persia and Egypt, learning from the Magi and priests." This has been quoted by Eusebius in *Preparatio Evangel.*, X. 4.

¹ *Orat. ad. Graec.*, p. 47 ed. by Otto:—"Boasting the Magian Ostanès."

² Strabo I. p. 49, cites a passage from Eratosthenes (flourished about 250 B.C.) who mentions Xanthus:—"So saying he praised the doctrine of Straton the naturalist, and also of Xanthus the Lydian. According to Xanthus there was a great drought under Artaxerxes."

³ Niebuhr, *Assur*, p. 64, places this conquest of Sardis in Olymp. 58, 1, i.e., in 548 B.C. On account of similarity I follow the *Fasti* of Clinton.

⁴ *De Thucyd. Ind. Th.*, VI, p. 817, ed. Reiske.

having taken place in the year of his birth ; in this case he was at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war (Olympiad 87, 2) not yet 70 years, and was 28 years old at the birth of Thucydides. But if Xanthus was born about B.C. 529, he might have been 98 years of age at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war (an age he might have attained), and 58 years older than Thucydides. But we are not compelled to believe that Xanthus was still living at the beginning of the said war, since it is not implied in those words. It is at all events certain that he did not finish his work before Olympiad 79, and that he was an older contemporary of Herodotus, and influenced, according to Ephorus,¹ in no small degree the Father of History.

As to the authenticity of the works of Xanthus a later critic, Artemon of Cassandra, advanced some doubts and believed that they were by Dionysius Skytobrachion. Yet so early a writer as Athenæus, who is named in the above passage, directs our attention to the fact that Xanthus is mentioned as early as in Ephorus (B.C. 333), and the use unhesitatingly made of Xanthus by authors like Eratosthenes, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Strabo, as well as the opinion which they had as to his age, is of by far greater importance than the single assertion of Artemon regarding whose critical capacity we have no information whatever.

We know as little about the time of this Dionysius, Suetonius in his book *De Grammaticis*, chapter 7, says of M. Antonius Gniphos :—(He was) “ in Alexandria, as some relate, and taught together with Dionysius Skytobrachion ; but I can hardly believe this, for their times do not agree.” Since Gniphos attained only an age of 50 years, and Cicero, being already prætor, is said to have heard his lectures, we must place his birth about B.C. 100 ; and if in order to take into consideration the doubts set forth by Suetonius as to the possibility of Gniphos having been educated together with Dionysius, we add still 50 years more for Dionysius, we only reach for the latter the middle of the second century before Christ. If, therefore, Dionysius had really forged the *Ludiaká* (‘ Lydian Matters ’) under the name of Xanthus, we are compelled to assume that the genuine *Ludiaká* lay before Ephorus and Eratosthenes, and that later authors, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo, either drew from that genuine work, or that they were deceived by a book which had been fabricated a few ages before them, during which time, moreover, the *Ludiaká* of Xanthus, still known to Eratosthenes, must have been supplemented by the spurious *Ludiaká* of Dionysius in such a manner that everything that was quoted from Xanthus by later writers, belonged to the fabricators.

The attempt of my venerable teacher, F. G. Welcker,² to prove the falsification from the fragments of Xanthus, is not at all cogent, nay he must even

¹ In *Athen.* XII, p. 515 :—“ Ephorus the historian recounts that he was older than Herodotus and had much influence upon him.”

² In Seebode's “ New Archives for Philology and Pedagogics,” 1830, p. 65—80. With him agree Müller in his extensive “ Collection of the Fragments of Greek Historians,” and Schwegler in his “ Roman History ” I., p. 262.

confess that several of them transmit to us popular and very antique legends. This distinguished investigator is chiefly shocked by those very statements which are ascribed to Xanthus concerning Zoroaster and his times, and by the fact that Xanthus is said to have written the *Magiká* ("Matters referring to the Magi"), from which book Clemens of Alexandria¹ draws information about the incestuous marriages among the Magi. But why should a man who has spent his whole life under the Persian sway, and consequently in daily intercourse with Magianism, have been unable to write such a book, whilst Herodotus, soon after him, treats the Persian religion in a very detailed manner?

Welcker, and after him Müller, hold it to be a characteristic of the Alexandrine period, that Xanthus speaks of the *Diadochi* ("successors" or "disciples") of Zoroaster; however, in the Zarathushtrian system this very tradition is proved by the original documents (yet they seem to be the words of Hermodorus, and not of Xanthus). It is self-evident that the conclusion of the fragment in Diogenes: "until the destruction of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great," could as little be found in a book falsely ascribed to Xanthus the Lydian, as in a genuine work (no forger could be so stupid); and Creuzer has already observed (in his 'History of Greek Fragments,' p. 224), that this conclusion indeed originates from Hermodorus.

But as to the statements of Xanthus with regard to kindred marriages and to the time of Zoroaster, the former undoubtedly exists in the Avesta texts,² and below we shall perceive that Xanthus (he may have written "six thousand" or "six hundred") has drawn his information about the time of Zoroaster from good sources, though he did not perhaps correctly understand them.

But even if we admit hypothetically that the *Ludiakí* of Xanthus was written by Dionysius Scytobrachion, what is proved by it against the *Magiká*? The doubt of Artemon exclusively refers to the former book.

Creuzer, it is true, has adduced a proof for the authenticity of the *Magiká* from the fact that in the narrative of Cyrus and Croesus (as it is apparently borrowed from the *Ludiakí* of Xanthus), Zoroaster, too, and likewise his *logiá* "sayings" are mentioned. But even without this help we are justified in believing that Xanthus the Lydian had treated of matters relating to the Magi, as long as the contrary opinion has not been proved. Welcker's objections to that narrative are, indeed, exaggerated; even they ascribe to the

¹ *Stromata*, III, p. 515 ed. by Potter:—"Xanthus in his book entitled *Magiká*, relates that the Magi have sexual intercourse with" [This false allegation is refuted by me in my Papers on "The Alleged Practice of Next-of-kin-Marriages in Old Irân," read in 1887 before the B. B. of the Royal Asiatic Society. *Eng. Trans.*] Clemens does not give to Xanthus the surname of "the Lydian." Diogenes Laertius (Introduction 2), on the contrary, expressly calls the Xanthus, whose statement regarding the age of Zoroaster he mentions, the Lydian, with whom the identity of the Xanthus alluded to by Clemens and Diogenes, is not yet strictly proved, though it is rendered probable.

² Comp. for instance *Visperad* 111, § 3 W. (III, § 18 in Spiegel's Translation of the Avesta).

text an error that is evidently not contained in it. It is of course evident that the dramatical embellishment of the story of the cremation of Cræsus is not the work of Xanthus, but of the vain-glorious rhetorician Nicolaus. Nevertheless, there does not exist the contradiction found therein by Welcker, that on the one hand the Persians, at the rising storm, remember *logiá* or prophetic sayings of Zoroaster; while, on the other hand, Zoroaster is supposed to be still living to forbid the burning of the dead body, and that Cræsus is regarded as contemporary with Zoroaster, while he is said by Xanthus in his *Magiká* to have lived 600 or 6,000 years before the campaign of Xerxes. For the *logiá* or sayings of Zoroaster, which occur to the minds of Persians, are designated by this very circumstance as something very old and forgotten, and in the next passage the author says, "as for Zoroaster, the Persians learned from him not to burn dead bodies, not to sully fire on any account, thus confirming the practice that had been established from ancient times." It is evidently the Persians, not Zoroaster alone, who inculcates anew the strict observance in future of some Zoroastrian law long existing. But that after the expression *ton gè mèn Zoroásren* something is omitted, perhaps some such word as *aidoumenos* "fearing, venerating," which has been already suggested by Valesius and Coray (see *Orelli, Supplementa*, note p. 42), whilst Müller expounds: "as to Zoroaster the Persians have....." However Welcker is not justified in supporting a contradiction between the *Magiká* and the *Ludiaká*; for nobody ascribes the *Magiká* to Dionysius Scytobrachion.

We are, therefore, confirmed in our opinion that the authentic Xanthus could simply relate in his *Ludiaká* concerning Cræsus nearly what Nicolaus, according to his manner, has embellished, and that, consequently, the mention of the Zoroastrian prohibition against the burning of the dead bodies can be drawn from him. We must not, however, forget that Nicolaus does not explicitly quote from the book of Xanthus, but that it is only most probable that he has drawn from that source. Nor do we think it strange that Xanthus should have written the *Magiká*, or at least treated of Zoroaster and his time, after the Cuneiform Inscriptions have informed us that the Auramazdian religion had predominated under the Achæmenidæ, and thus it was perfectly known to the Lydian Xanthus by personal observation.

However, it might be objected, how is it possible that the older Xanthus made mention of Zoroaster and his laws, whilst the later Herodotus, who treats in so detailed and expert a manner of Persian life and Persian religion, entirely keeps silent upon this matter? Here I will lay no stress upon the fact that Herodotus, too, contains some information drawn from Xanthus, as, e.g., the prohibition against burning corpses (Bk. III, 16); the marriage with one's sister (III, 31) which he traces back, it is true, to Cambyses. Rather we must insist upon the fact that all those who either consider Zoroaster to be far older than, or contemporary with the father of Darius, all those who

1 *Vide* Creuzer, "History of Greek Fragments," p. 502. Müller, "Fragments of Greek History," I, p. 40.

think Xanthus to be either authentic or forged, have to solve the enigma. The Auramazdian religion existed as early as the time of Darius and predominated in the Persian Empire, and yet Herodotus does not mention Zoroaster or Ahura-Mazda. This problem cannot, I believe, be explained by those who make Zoroaster a contemporary of Hystaspes, the father of Darius. For, how could it be possible that Herodotus had not mentioned so powerful a religious crisis happening hardly two generations before his birth?

However, not taking into consideration the Zarathushtrian epoch, how was it possible that Herodotus did not even know the prophet Zoroaster, whilst Plato, who flourished 55 years after Herodotus, was accurately informed about Zarathushtra, and apparently must have drawn from sources which were at least as old as Herodotus? The description given by the latter concerning Persian customs and religion (Bk. I, 131-140) contains, moreover a series of features truly Zarathushtrian; as, for instance, the worship of the deities without images or temples; the offering of sacrifices to Zeus (who is evidently Ahura Mazda), to the Sun, Moon, Earth, Fire, Water, and Winds (*vide* Yasna XVI, 4); the worship of Anâhita, whom he calls Mithra; the description of the sacrifice at which a Magus standing near sings the theogony, which points to sacrificial prayers, such as the Yasna and the Yashts; the victims which were, according to him, bulls, horses, camels, and asses, whilst the poor offered "small pieces of mutton," just as in the Yashts horses, cattle and smaller animals are offered (Abân Yasht., § 21), and in Vendidad, Farg. XXII, § 3, horses, camels, cattle, and smaller animals are vowed.¹ The stress laid on the begetting of children, on veracity and freedom from debts; the religious observance done to the rivers, and the prohibition against making water in them or in the presence of another person; the interdict against the burning of corpses (Bk. III, 16); the marriage with one's sister (Bk. III, 31)²; the necessity of exposing the corpses that they may be eaten by dogs or birds before the bones are consigned to the charnel-house; the zeal with which the Magi destroy ants, serpents, and other vermin, whilst they are forbidden to kill dogs and men; all these and other features indisputably prove that Herodotus well knew the Magian belief, as it is expounded in the Avesta texts, although here and there he misunderstood it. That he does not mention the name of Zarathushtra, whose religion he interprets, is, we may hence infer, a mere matter of chance, or he had some special reason unknown to us, perhaps because Xanthus had already treated of it. Or should we conceive that Herodotus became acquainted with the Magian belief merely from oral tradition recounted by men who were not well disposed towards

¹ Heraclides Cumanus, a writer of uncertain date (*comp.* Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* II, p. 95), who has treated of Persian customs, religion, laws and history in a work entitled *Persika*, consisting of at least two books. He says in one of the Fragments in *Athenæus* IV, p. 145:—"The Persian king offers 1,000 sacrificial animals every day; among these are horses, camels, oxen, asses, stags, and plenty of sheep; also many birds are sacrificed." Here the number "one thousand" victims is given as in the *Yashts*,

² *Vide* note 1, p. 78 *Eng. Trans.*

the Magi, and who, therefore, kept secret the name of the founder of their religion? Suffice it to observe that in the silence of Herodotus concerning Zarathushtra we have a remarkable instance of how little value is to be attached to the *argumentum a silentio*, even where, as here, the most direct occasion of mentioning him might be given.

After Xanthus the Lydian had explicitly treated of Zoroaster, after Herodotus had described the religious system founded by him, and after Plato's predecessors in philosophy, Pythagoras and Democritus, had been in intercourse with the Magi, we should not be surprised if we find Zoroaster and the God proclaimed by him in the works of Plato¹ (*vide supra*, p. 82). The fact indeed need not be ignored that the authenticity of this dialogue is contested by several critics, while it is defended by others (*e.g.*, Hermann, *Geschichte und System der Plat. Philos.*, "The History and System of Platonic Philosophy," I, p. 439). For our purpose it will suffice to assume that

¹ The story of Er, son of Armenius (so the words, *ton Armenion* "of the Armenian Er," are explained by the Scholiast), of the Pamphylian race, is related by Plato in his book called the *Republik* (X, p. 614. B. *seq.*), that he fell in the battle and revived again on the funeral bed, and proclaimed the mysteries of the other world. This story is ascribed by Clements Alexandrinus (*Stromata* V, p. 711) to Zoroaster, who is directly identified with Er:—"The same Plato, in his tenth book on the *Republik*, mentions *Er*, the Armenian (or son of Armenius), a Pamphylian, that is Zoroaster (in all four passages *Zoroastres*). At any rate Zoroaster himself writes:—"These things have been written by Zoroaster son of Armenius, a pamphylian, who died in battle, arrived in Hades and was taught there by the gods." As to this Zoroaster, Plato recounts that he lay on his funeral bed on the twelfth day and revived. He here perhaps metaphorically implies resurrection, as well as the idea that through the way across the 12 zodiacal signs the soul is taken up, and says that by the same way the souls come down when they come into (material) existence." Whence this mistake arose in Clemens, may be guessed from the words:—"These things have been written by Zoroaster." Probably in one of the Greek Pseudo-Zoroastrian books Zoroaster is represented as relating the story of Her. Or can Her have been reckoned as a Zoroastrian and called himself *Zarathushtrish* (*comp.* Yasna I, § 23)? From which reasons have the latter writers made him Zoroaster himself? The story itself scarcely contain any Zarathushtrian reminiscences. Neither Plutarch, (*Sympos. Probl.* IX, 5, 2):—"That they speak of the intellectual nature of Heaven and the harmonious course of the universe as a winged chariot, and further more they call that messenger from Hades, the Pamphylian, the son of Armenius by the name of *Er*", nor Justinus (*Cohort. ed. Gent.* 27), nor Origenes (*adversus Cels.* II, 16), nor Augustin (*de Civitate Dei* XXII, 28) who relate the story of *Her*, know anything about his identity with Zoroaster (*Cyrillus, VIII, adv. Julian. Theodoret. Serm.* 11, p. 653). As for the rest Arnobius, too, makes use of this passage (*adv. G. I.*, p. 31, ed. Lugdunensis Lyon). Macrobius in *Somn. Scrip.* I, 1:—"This relater of mysteries in Plato is a certain Er, a Pamphylian by birth, and a soldier by profession. He seems to have died of the wounds which he had received in battle. On the 12th day after his death he was to have been honoured with the last rites of the pyre together with others who had fallen victims with him; but suddenly he revived or had perhaps retained his life. He proclaimed to mankind whatever he had seen or done during this time. Cicero, as if he were conscious himself of its truth, regrets the ridicule cast upon this tradition by unlearned people, and while believing it to be true, he prefers the idea of awakening to that of reviving, as if he would avoid the reproach of dullness." To this Mai, p. 311 (Stuttgart edition), adds the following observation:—"As to the name and kindred of Er. (by some called Zoroaster), many excellent things have been written by Proclus whose work I shall publish. In this work Proclus mentions his own and Zoroaster's work, and the authors Cornius and Theodorus Asinaeus."

Zoroaster was known in Greece in the time of Plato. The assertion of later writers¹ that Plato had travelled to the country inhabited by the Magi and the Persians, is opposed by that of Diogenes of Laërte², that Plato had intended going to the Magi; but that he was prevented from doing so by the wars then raging in Asia. However, both these statements presuppose that Persia and its religion had excited a very high interest among inquiring Greeks of that period. For this reason an important contemporary of Plato, Eudoxus of Cnidus, who is said by Apollodorus (*comp.* Diog. Laërt., VIII, 90) to have attained his youth about B. C. 368 (Olympiad, 103), and who was distinguished as lawgiver, physician, and astronomer, treated in his last work : *Gés Périodos* ("The Revolution of the Earth") of the Magi (*comp.* Plutarch, *De Isis et Osiris*, *ibid*) as is attested by Diogenes of Laërte (Proem. 8). If we might take the words of Diogenes literally, they would imply that Eudoxus asserts just as Aristotle does some years later, that the Magi were older than the Egyptians. According to the Magi there are two principles, the good and the bad genii, Oromazdes and Areimanios. According to Pliny (XXX, 1, 2) Eudoxus also agreed with Aristotle in placing Zoroaster 6,000 years before Christ. But a distinguished historian of those days, Dino,³ the father of Clitarchus, the companion of Alexander, has written towards the end of the Persian Empire (yet he mentions an incident relating to Ochus B. C. 350) a work entitled *Persiká* ("Persian Matters"), divided into three *suntáxeis* or volumes; the first part was called *Assuriaká*, the second *Mediká*, and the third *Persiká*. Each volume contained several sections. From this excellent source a great deal is drawn that we read in Cornelius Nepos and Plutarch, and some fragments prove to us that he enlarged also on the religious side of Persian life. I pass over the mere historical statements found in the fragments of Dino's writings, and speak of only those notices which relate to the religion. In the fifth fragment (II, p. 90, I) edited by Müller,⁴ Dino says

¹ Lactantius, *Institutiones* IV, 2 : "I must wonder at the fact that Pythagoras, and afterwards Plato, who had been stimulated by the love of truth, went to the Egyptians, the Magi, and the Persians, in order to learn their religions and ceremonies (thinking that wisdom was to be found in their religions); but they did not go to the Jews. *Comp.* Plinius, *Hist. Nat.*, XXX, 1.2.

² III., 7 :—"Plato resolved to pay a visit to the Magi, too, but he did not fulfil that resolution, fearing the war in Asia."—Apuleius, *de habitud. doctrin. Plat. Phil.*, p. 509, ed. Florid.:—"He would have directed his attention to the Indians and the Magi but for the Asiatic wars."

³ *Comp.* Müller, *Fragmenta Historia Gr.* II, p. 88 seq.

⁴ Diogenes Laërtius, *Proem.* I, 8 :—"Yet they were not versed in mantology by witchcraft, as stated by Aristotle in his book *Magiká*. Dinon says in the Fifth Book of his *History*, that the word Zoroaster should be translated the 'adorer of stars.' This is also confirmed by Hermondorus." Menage and Bochart would rather spell the name *Astrotheaten* "a beholder of stars," "a star-gazer" (instead of *Astrothulen* "a worshipper of stars"). Toup has *Astrotheten* "a commander of star"; yet the ordinary reading is determined by the *Scholias* of Plato, *Alcibiades*, p. 122. I add here the *Scholion* to this passage of *Alcibiades* in the Scholiast (Plato, Tome VI., p. 281, ed. Stam.):—"Zoroaster is said to have been older than Plato by 6,000 years; some say that he was a Greek, or a man of that nation which came from the Continent on the other side of the great water. He is

that the Magi did not know the mantic magic, which is entirely correct; as the Avesta texts abhor, and are opposed everywhere to the nature of the sorcerer (*yâtu*), and designate it as something diabolical (*comp.*, e.g., Vend., Farg. 1, §§ 14-15). The translation of the name *Zarathushtra*, however, reminds us of the explanation which travellers are wont to receive from their guides. Probably the interpreter sought in the first syllable *zor* the Persian word *zôr*=Avesta *zaothra* meaning "offering"; while *astres* was identified unhesitatingly with the Greek *astér* "a star." Besides, this attempt at explanation evinces with what interest the Greeks endeavoured to penetrate into the matter in question.

The art of divination by magic was, as Dino affirms, abhorred by the Magi, who, he says, on the contrary predict by means of twigs (i.e., rhabdomaney),¹ which might recall to our mind the *Wünschelrute*, "the divining rod," of German Mythology. But we must rather allude to the bunch of twigs, which play so important a part in the Persian liturgy under the name of *baresman*. According to Anquetil (*Usages*, Vol. II, p. 532), this *barsam* is made of the wood of the pomegranate tree, of the tamarisk, or of the date tree. But the latter *murikinon xûlon* is the wood of the tamarisk with which the Magi, according to Strabo,² chanted hymns, holding a bunch of fine twigs in their hands. Dino³ further relates that the Persian and the Median Magi

said to have learnt universal wisdom from the good spirit, that is, from the excellent understanding. His name translated into Greek means *Astrothutes*, 'a starworshipper'. He recommended the anchoretic life and moderation in living. He left several books from which it is demonstrated that he professed three kinds of philosophy, viz., physical, economical, and political." And in the preceding passage the author states:—"That Zoroaster kept silence from his seventh year, and that he announced the whole philosophy to the Persian King (Vishtâsp) at 30 years of age, and that the number seven was sacred to Mithra, whom the Persians chiefly venerate." The references as to Zoroaster having been older than Plato by 6,000 years, are drawn from Aristotle or Eudoxus, and the notice about the signification of the name of Zoroaster from Dino. That Zoroaster had received his instruction from the Good Spirit, i.e., Ahura Mazda, is as correct as the explanation, "that is, from the excellent understanding," as far as this is meant of *Mainyush-khratush*, "the heavenly understanding." Of the anchoretic life of Zoroaster we shall speak in another place. That Zoroaster kept silence from his seventh year, and announced after thirty years this doctrine to the King, is confirmed by other authorities; also the *Syngrammata*. Quite unique stands the statement:—He was a Greek, or one of those who came forth from the Continent on the other side of the great sea. This last expression is very obscure; it sounds too mysterious to designate the Greeks of Asia Minor. Is it perhaps some reminiscence of the passage of the primitive man to the six *keshevars* which took place under Tahmurap? Or of the Atlantids?

¹ *Schol. Nicand. Ther.*, 613:—"The Magi and the Scythians prophesy by means of tamarisk wood; in many places they prophesy also by staves. Dinon says, in the third chapter of the first book, that the Median magicians, too, predict by staves."

² XV, p. 733:—"They sing their lays for a long time, holding a bunch of small tamarisk twigs."

³ Clemens Alexandrinus, *Cohortatio*, ed. Gent., c. 5, p. 56, ed. Potter:—"They (i.e., the Persians, the Medians, and the Magi) sacrifice, says Dinon, in the open air, believing that fire and water are the only images of deities." Clemens adds that "after a long period of years" the image-worship of Anahita was introduced by Artaxerxes Mnemon. It is clear that this opinion presupposes the idea of a higher antiquity of Zarathushtra

offer sacrifice in the open air, and that they regard fire and water as the only likeness of the divinities. This statement is quite well founded if it is correctly understood. Images of gods were unknown to the ancient Persians, and the high veneration shown by them to the sacred fire and water must have evoked in the observing Greek the opinion that fire and water were considered by the Persians as symbols of the Deity.

Two characteristic facts are preserved by Dino,¹ which prove that he drew his information from authentic sources. He says that amongst the heathens, too, there were heroic bards, and that such bards had predicted the valour of Cyrus and his future wars against Astyages. For, when Cyrus went to Persia and Astyages was sailed with his friends, the most celebrated bard named Angares was called in, and he sang the common lays which he concluded with the words :—" A huge beast will be set free in the swamps more formidable than a wild boar ; no sooner shall he have sway over his country than he will easily fight against many." But when Astyages asked : " What animal?" He answered² :—" Cyrus the Persian." Astyages having been persuaded that the suspicion was well-founded, sent his messenger to call back Cyrus, but in vain.

It is highly interesting to see Dino mentioning an old lay on this king of the Ophidian dynasty, which is said by Moses of Chorene to have been celebrated (*vide Zor. St.*, p. 138) by the popular songs of the Armenians. The name of the bard Angares reminds us of the Vedic *Angiras* ; but the lay contains an idea common in the Avesta texts, personifying victory (*Verethraghna*) in the shape of a formidable boar with sharp claws and tusks (see Windischmann. *Mithra*, p. 41).

Another similar fact from Dino has been preserved by Cicero.³ Cyrus sees in a dream the sun at his feet, and thrice attempts in vain to take hold of than the (short period of) two hundred years which intervened between Hystaspes, the father of Darius, and Artaxerxes Mnemon.

¹ *Athen*, XIV, p. 633 c., wherein mention is made of the bard Phemius in Homer, who celebrated the heroes :—" This usage has been preserved also by the barbarians, as related by Dino in his *Persiká*. For the bards predicted the valour of Cyrus I. and his war against Astyages. For when, he says, Cyrus entered into Persia, he met at first the mace-bearers and afterwards the life-guards ; when Astyages was carousing with his friends and Angares, the most famous of the bards who was called in, was singing the ordinary songs. At the end of the feast, he says, a great beast is sent away into the moor, stronger than a wild boar. As soon as he begins to rule in his neighbourhood, he easily combats with many. But when Astyages questioned : " what animal ? " He replied :—" Cyrus, the Persian." Astyages believing that this suspicion was well-founded sent people to call back Cyrus, but in vain."

² [" A mighty beast, more fierce than wildest boar,
Is to his marshes gone, why should he go ?
When master of the country all around,

To hunters he will prove a deadly foe.—*Tr. n.*"]

³ *De Divinatione*. I., c. 23 :—" Shall I recount from the *Persiká* of Dino what the Magi have interpreted to the famous King Cyrus ? For, when he was sleeping the sun appeared to be at his feet, and he sought three times in vain to touch him with his hand, when the sun rolled back and disappeared then the Magi (*i.e.*, wise and learned men in Persia) predicted to him from this triple attempt on the sun, that Cyrus would reign for 30 years. So it was ; for after having begun to reign at 40, he lived to 70 years."

him, until the sun contracts and disappears. The Magi predict to him from this threefold attempt a reign of thirty years. This sun is evidently the *hvarēnô ahvaretem* (or *kâvaem*, for both are adequate), the majesty originating in God, the splendour, the fortune of kings, so often spoken of in the Avesta texts, and which is said (in *Zamyâd Yasht*, §§ 56 seq.) to have been thrice sought for and seized in vain by Afrâsiâb, and to have been borne away each time to the Lake *Vouru-kasha*. The parallel is too striking to be misunderstood. I do not hence conclude that Dino himself had passages like those of the *Yasht* cited above, lying before him, yet I may infer that his statements were drawn from sources such as those old songs, allegories, and expressions, which correspond to our Avesta texts; and that Dino consequently bears testimony to the antiquity of the contents of the latter. It is uncertain whether Clitarchus, the son of Dino, has spoken of it in his history of the Magi; for the long fragment cited by Diogenes appears to belong to others, only the words, "the gymnosophists condemned to death," seem to appertain to the physician in ordinary to Alexander the Great. However, the passage is certainly taken from an able author, and will be mentioned below. Though somewhat younger than Dino and Plato, Aristotle devoted his attention so much the more to the Magi, because, as we have seen, Greek philosophers and historians had found an intimate acquaintance, for nearly two centuries, with this feature of Oriental life and had partly described it. In his "Metaphysics" (X., p. 301, 8th edition by Brand¹) he once touches slightly upon the doctrine of the first causes. According to Diogenes of Laerte,² he has written a special book entitled *Magikós*, which is, however, ascribed by others to Antisthenes or Rhodon,³ and he has enlarged upon the doctrines of the Magi in a larger work entitled *Peri Philosophias* ("On Philosophy"). Valuable is, indeed, the fragment preserved by Diogenes,⁴ wherein Aristotle says: "The Magi are older than the Egyptians, and there are two first causes, the good genius and the evil genius." The one is called Zeus and Oromazdes, the other Hades and Arcimenios, which is the first mention particularly of the evil genius of the Magi, expressly made by the Greeks. Besides, Pliny⁵ traces back to Aristotle the opinion

¹ "Others, too, explain the first causes as cleverly as the Magi."

² Proem. 1:—"There are Magi among the Persians, as Aristotle says in his book *Magiká*." *Ibid* 8:—"They did not know that prophecy was executed by sorcery, said Aristotle in his book *Magiká*, and Dino. etc." (see above).

³ Suidas *sub voce* *Antisthenes*, "the first boon on *Magiká*, which treats of the Magian Zoroaster who invented philosophy; but the invention of philosophy is also ascribed by some to Aristotle, by others to Rhodon." Cf. Brandis, "History of Philosophy," II, 2, p. 84, seq.

⁴ Proem. 8:—"Aristotle in his first book on Philosophy relates that the Magi are older than the Egyptians, and that they believe in two first causes, a good spirit and an evil spirit. The first, they say, is called Zeus and Oromazdes, the second Hades and Arcimenios." The latter form of the name sounds already nearly alike to Neo-Persian Ahri-man; and there exist many other symptoms to indicate that the vulgar Irânian idioms had been already formed in that period.

⁵ *Hist. Nat.*, XXX, 1, 2:—"Eudoxus who thinks that they are among the most celebrated and useful section of philosophers, narrated that Zoroaster lived 8,000 years before the death of Plato, and so did Aristotle."

that Zoroaster lived six thousand years before the death of Plato. Indeed we have to regret very much the loss of these books of Aristotle, the master of philosophy, as they contained not only historical and highly trustworthy dates, but also treated of the speculative conception of Magism.

Not the less should we regret the loss of that book which the renowned historian Theopompus, in his great work *Philippiká*, devoted to Zoroaster and the Magi. Born about B.C. 378, he wrote 12 books on *Helleniká* and 58 books on *Philippiká*; of the latter 53 were still existing in the time of Photius (*Cod.* 176, p. 390), and in the eight of these books he enlarged upon Zoroaster and the Magi,¹ bearing testimony not merely to what has been quoted above from Aristotle regarding Ahura-Mazda Angrô-Mainyush, but also the Resurrection doctrine of the Magi of which we shall speak further on. From him drew also Plutarch,² who quotes him by name. What he has besides preserved in his work, *De Iside et Osir.*, ch. 46 and 47, on the doctrine of the Magi, may partly have been borrowed from Dino, Aristotle, Eudoxus, Hermodorus, Hermippus and Sotion: however, we will consider Theopompus as his principal authority. Here I add, therefore, those invaluable fragments of Greek knowledge on Magism, abstaining from any detailed explanation concerning those points which are or will be treated of by me in other places.

"Some believe," so says Plutarch following his authors, "that there are two divine powers working in opposition to each other, the one is the creator of the good, the other is the creator of the bad; some call the better one God, the other Demon, like Zoroaster the Magus, who is said to have lived 5,000 years before the Trojan war.³ He called the one Oromazes, the other Arcimanius, declaring that the former, more than any other thing perceptible through the senses, resembled light, the other, on the contrary, darkness and ignorance;⁴ but between these two stands Mithra, who is for that reason called by the Persians "Mithra the Mediator." He taught to offer supplications and thanksgiving to the former, but deprecation and gloomy sacrifices to the latter. Pounding a certain herb, called *omomi*, in a mortar,⁵ they invoke Hades and Darkness, and then mix it (i.e., the juice of the herb) with the blood of a slain wolf, and take it to a place which is not illumined by the sun, and cast it away. For, some of the plants they regard as pertaining to the good God, while others to the evil Demon; and some of the animals, e.g., dogs, birds, and

¹ The eighth book existed during the life-time of Photius. Perhaps, it might still be found somewhere. Diogenes Laertius, *Proem.* 8, adds, after *Arcimanius*, to the words cited above:—"This is related also by Hermippus in his first book on the Magi, by Eudoxus in his *Travels*, and by Theopompus in the eighth chapter of the *Philippika*. Theopompus also says that, according to the Magi, men will revive again and be immortal, and that things and names will keep together."

² On *Isis and Osiris*, 47:--In the eighth book of Theopompus is also contained an allusion to Pythagoras (*see Allren.*, V. p. 213 *seq.*)

³ This is borrowed from Hermodorus.

⁴ In other passages, too, these contrasts are mentioned by Plutarch.

⁵ It has long since been observed that this fully agrees with the preparation of the *haoma*-juice, and that these "round stones" are the *hâvanas* of stone and iron, in which the sacred plant is pounded.

hedgehogs, as belonging to the former, but water-mice to the latter ; for which reason that person is called happy who kills most of them (*viz.* the evil creatures)."

" But they (*i.e.*, the Magi), too, relate many wondrous things about the divine existences, as for example the following :—Oromazes emanating from the purest light, and Areimanios from darkness, fight against each other. Oromazes created six *Amesha-Spentas* : the first that of bounty, the second that of truth, the third that of good government ; but of the remaining he made one the spirit of wisdom, another that of riches, and the last that of the pleasures of the beautiful creations in Nature. Areimanios made an equal number, as it were, of antagonists. Afterwards Oromazes enlarged himself three-fold, and withdrew from the sun as far as the earth is remote from the sun, and decorated the heaven with stars ; but one star, namely, Sirius, was placed by him before all as guardian and forerunner. And when Oromazes created 24 gods, he placed them in an oval body, but as many evil spirits as were created by Areimanios perforating it entered into it.....(a gap), for which reason good is intermixed with evil. There will come a predestined time during which Areimanios, who brings pestilence and hunger will entirely perish at the hands of the good genii, and will disappear ; for when the earth has become even and level, there must appear *one* life and a community of all happy men, who will likewise speak one language. But Theopompus says that, according to the Magi, one of these divine powers will reign by turns for three thousand years when the other will be swayed over ; for another 3,000 years they will combat and war against each other, and the one will destroy the creation of the other. But at length Hades will succumb and men shall be happy, neither wanting food nor throwing a shadow. The Supreme Power, who is to effect this, will rest and repose for a time, though long in itself, yet moderate for the God as if He were a sleeping man."

It has already been observed elsewhere (*vide* Windischmann, *Mithra* p. 56 *seq.*) that whatever is said about the opposition of the two spirits, about their nature as light and darkness, about *Mithra* and the *Andarvâi*, literally harmonizes with the Avesta texts and the Bundahish which is based on them. What is said concerning the *haoma*-offering, ought to be correctly understood. Every Magian offering is in itself partly an appeasing of Ahura Mazda, partly a counteracting of the evil spirits ; but, moreover, we find along with the *euktaia* " invocations," and *charisêria* " prayers " unto Ahura and the *yazatas*, also *âpotropia kai skuthropê* " deprecations and execrations " against Angrô-Mainyush and the Demons (*cf. e.g. Vendidad*, Farg. X, §§ 9, 10, 13, 16 ; XI, § 8, *seq.*) ; it is especially said with regard to the *haoma*-offering that the least squeezing out of the *haoma*-juice, the least eulogy of the *haoma*, the least drinking of the *haoma*, serves for a " thousand killings of the *daevas* " (*Yasna* X, § 6). We must not put stress, therefore, upon the word *thûein* " to offer," as it would not be correct to say that something is offered to Angrô-Mainyush ; on the contrary, rather *thûein* is joined here by a zeugma with the next

proposition to which it is not adopted. But the word *anakalountai* "they are called upon aloud," is quite appropriate, referring to the imprecations against the *daevas*, which have been alluded to above. It is also true that the wolf is an Ahrimanic animal; that among the prayers addressed to *haoma* in the hymn (*Yasna* IX, § 21), there is the entreaty that the wolf may be seen in due time lest he surprise man; and that wolves are among the evil creatures which are to be fought against (see *Yasht* III, § 8). But it is not affirmed by the Avesta texts. On the contrary, it seems to contradict the religious system. That the *haoma*-juice is mixed with the blood of the wolf was, perhaps, a statement derived from some local usage deviating from the Magian rigour; or it was not the juice, but the remaining fibres which were used in this way.

What follows about the distribution of plants and animals between the two demiurgi, can be completely instanced by the texts, specially the Bundahish. How much dogs were esteemed, is proved by the Fargards treating of them. The *échinus chersaios*, "the hedgehog living on dry land," is that animal which in Farg. XIII, § 2, is designated as the chief antagonist of the demons:—*Spânem sizdrem urvisarem yim vanghâparem yim mashyâka, avi duzvachanghê duzakem nâma aojaiti*. The Huzvareh translation gives the name *zûzak* (comp. Bundahish, Westergaard's edition, p. 30, l. 15:—"the *zaozag* which is called *khârpûsht*," literally "sting-hide"; and p. 49, l. 1, where it is said:—"the *zûzak* voids its water into all the holes of the corn-training ants, and kills thousands of them." The word *zûzak* is apparently a variation of *duzaka*.) It is the ant-eater: *tachyglossus aculeatus*¹ *sizdrem* seems to contain in its first part another form of *tîz* (comp. Sanskrit *sigra*), and to mean "stinged," "prickled," or "pointed."

The Ahrimanic animal is here called in the common text: *thous enhudrous*, "one living in water, i.e., an animal," which in contrast to *chersaios*, "one living on land," and with the supplement *échinus*, "a hedgehog," must denote a kind of water-hedgehog; (*énhudris*, "the otter," being an animal sacred to the Persians, cannot be meant here). Another passage of the same Plutarch² shows that here also *mus* "a mouse" is to be supplied, the mouse being an evil animal (comp. *Sad-dar*, chap. XLVII).

That the six gods created by Oromazes are the six *Amesha-Spentas*, has been known long ago.³ Their names, according to their moral value, as for instance, in the Gâthâs,⁴ and exclusive of their physical import, are rendered

¹ [A technical term in Natural History; the expression means "stinged sharp tongue."—*Trans. note.*]

² *Quæst. conviv.*, IV, 5, 2:—"The Magi, being followers of Zoroaster, esteem in the highest degree the land-hedgehog, but hate water-mice, and call him, who kills most of them, a friend of the good spirits and a happy man."

³ Burnouf, *Comm.*, *Yasna* I, p. 150 *seq.*, and the passage in Neriosengh, p. 146.

⁴ *Vôhu-manô* is translated by Neriosengh, in *Yasna* XXVIII, § 2, by the words:—*uttaman manas*. *Ash. vah.* in *Ys.* XXVIII, §§ 4 and 6, and *Ys.* XXIX, 2, by *dharma*; yet in verse 11 also by *satyatâ*; *Khshathram* by *râjyam*; in *Ys.* XXIX, 11, the names *Ashavah*. *Vôhu-manô* and *Kshathra-vairyo* are explained by *punyam*, *uttamannmanô*, and *râjyam*. *Ys.* XXXI. 4: *punya*=*Ash. vah.* [*Armaiti*=*sampûrnamânasa* XXVIII, § 8; and XXXIV, 9 *Haurvatât*=*sarvapravrtti*; *Ameretat*=*amrtiyupravrtti*, XXX. 6.]

excellently. *Vohu-manô*, "the good mind," is the *demiourgos Eeunoios*, "the demiurgus of benevolence;" according to the physical meaning he is "the lord of cattle and other animals." *Asha-vahishta* is "the best purity or truth." I have elsewhere shown that he is the *Omânes* of Strabo, and that the name *Ochos* is derived also from it; for both of them morally mean *asha*, the *demiourgos Aletheias*, "the demiurgus of truth," and physically imply "the lord of fire." *Khshathra-vairya*, "the excellent or venerable lord," is at the same time "the lord of metals." *Spentâ-armaiti* "the humble pious mind," the *demiourgos Sophias* "the demiurgus of wisdom," is physically "the genius of the earth." *Haurvatât*, "the preserver and feeder," who gives terrestrial blessings, the *demiourgos Ploutou* "the demiurgus of riches," is physically the lord of water. *Ameretât*, the *Amandatos* of Strabo, physically "the lord of trees," is at the same time morally "the genius of reward in heaven."

Quite appropriate is the Greek expression *antitechnous*, "the opposing or opponent," which has been chosen to designate the adverse nature of the Ahrimanian (evil) genii, and to render the Avesta word *paityâra* (comp. Haug, *Gâthâs*, p. 223); for in contrast to these six *Amesha-Spentas* literally stand the evil spirits, *Akôman*, *Andar*, *Saurva*, *Taromat*, *Tarich* and *Zarich* in the Pahlavi Bundahish (Westergaard's edition, p. 76, l. 6 compared with p. 5, l. 9), whose statements are based on the original Avesta texts, as for example the *Zamyâd Yasht*, § 96.

The triple enlargement by Oromazes, which reminds us of the triple enlargement of the earth by *Yima*, seems to refer to the three heavens through which, as through stages, it is possible to reach the highest habitation of God; (see *Yasht Fragment II*; and Spiegel, *Parsi Grammatik*, p. 188). The *Yasna* XIX, § 6, also seems to point to this triple growth. The term of distance, "as far as the sun is from the earth," is truly Avestic.

The great eulogy of Sirius, *i.e.*, the Avestic *Tishtrya*, is confirmed by the sacrificial hymn on this *yazata*, and it is very remarkable that in the Bundahish, p. 77, after describing the creation of the stars, *Tishtar* is called the first leader in their rising.

The remaining twenty-four good genii are the *yazatas*, whose number can be variously given. Twenty of them, besides *Ahura Mazda* and the six *Amesha-Spentas*, give their names to the days of the month (comp. *Yasna* XVI, § 3 *seq.*) To these four others might easily be added, as for instance, *Nairyô-sangha*, *Airyama-ishya*, *Anâhita* (if this is not already included in water), *Haoma*, *etc.*

Truly I know no Avestic passage in which the universe is represented as an egg (a conception very common with the Indians); yet the idea of a heaven by which everything is surrounded cannot be explained but by a

(8) $\frac{1}{x^2} = x^{-2}$, $\frac{d}{dx} x^{-2} = -2x^{-3} = -\frac{2}{x^3}$, $\frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{x^2} = -\frac{2}{x^3}$

עליון מן המעלה והוא נקרא העליון (9) ו' עליון
 עליון נקרא עליון מן המעלה והוא נקרא העליון
 מן המעלה והוא נקרא העליון (10) ו' עליון
 מן המעלה והוא נקרא העליון ו' עליון

¹ (8) *Aiḡh dsmān va Zamīk va āv va avārtīg kōlā mā andarūn khāyagīh aēdūn. hūmānāk chēgūn mōrādūn khāēyak*-1. (9) *Va dsmān azpar zamīk khāiyak hūmānāk pavan yedd-kārīh ī Dādār Aūharmazd vīnārd yekavīmānēd*, (10) *va Zamīk bēn mīyān ī dsmān angūshīdak aēdūn hūmānāk chēgūn zardak mīyān ī khāēyēk*. [I have here quoted the original Pahlavi text instead of giving Windischmann's transliteration of the Pazend. *Trans. note.*]

³ Proem. 9 :—"This is also related by Eudemus the Rhodian."

were the offspring of the Magi (see Diogenes, Proem 9). One of the Platonists, Hermodorus (when he lived is unfortunately unknown to us), has written a book, *Peri Mathematon* ("On Science"), and he is mentioned by Diogenes¹ as bearing testimony to the opinion that Zoroaster had lived 5,000 years before the fall of Troy.

To this Hermodorus I trace back (as has been already said above regarding Xanthus), whatever else is found in the passage of Diogenes,² viz. :—"That the Platonist Hermodorus says in his book on the *Mathemata*,—"From the Magi, beginning with Zoroaster the Persian, to the fall of Troy, there are 5,000 years.' That, on the contrary, Xanthus the Lydian says :—"Up to the campaign of Xerxes in Hellas it is 600 years from Zoroaster, and after him there flourished many Magi who succeeded each other, viz.. the *Ostanes*, *Astrampsychs*, *Gobryas*, and *Pazats*, until the dissolution of the Persian Empire."

Nevertheless, we shall soon observe that Zoroaster was placed 5,000 years before the Trojan War by Hermippus too; and further on we shall comment upon the opinions regarding the age of Xanthus.

A succession of the Magi beginning from Zoroaster, is entirely founded on original indigenous documents, for *Isat-vâstra*, the son of Zarathushtra (comp. *Farvardin Yasht*, §98), is, according to the Bundahish (p. 79, l. 16), the chief *môbad*, and in line 13 of the same page it is said that all the mobads of Persia are descended from the royal family of Minuchehar.

The name *Ostanai*, which sometimes denotes a species, is given to a Magus who accompanied Xerxes into Greece, and wrote a book on his Magian art (*vide* Plinius, *Historia Naturalis*, "Natural History," XXX, 1, 8)³ and after him to a Magus in the suite of Alexander. The word seems to be derived

¹ Proem. 2.

² Plutarch, *On Isis and Osiris*, 46 :—"Like Zoroaster the Magian, who is said to have lived 5,000 years before the Trojan War;" probably taken from Hermippus. Proem. 2 :—"From the Magi, whose first teacher was Zoroaster the Persian, to the conquest of Troy there were 5,000 years as stated by the Platonist Hermodorus in his book *Peri Mathematon* ('About Sciences')." But Xanthus the Lydian says :—"Till the campaign of Xerxes in Greece there was a period of 600 years from Zoroaster, and after him there flourished very many Magi succeeding each other, viz., the *Ostanai*, the *Astrampsychoi*, *Gobryai*, and *Pazatai* up to the destruction of the Persian Empire by Alexander." This passage lay before the eyes of Suidas, who writes under the word Magi, that they were "the Persian philosophers and theologians, whose teacher was Zoroaster, and after him there succeeded the *Ostanai* and *Astrampsychoi*." Under the word *Ostanes* he remarks :—"They were formerly called Magi by the Persians, afterwards *Ostanai*." And under the word *Zoroaster*, he calls him "a Perso-Median philosopher, who first introduced among the Persians the name of Magi, and lived 500 years before the Trojan war" (500 instead of 5,000). And Phevarinus says :—"The *Ostanes* were formerly called Magi by the Persians." The names *Ostanes*, *Astrampsychos*, and *Zoroastriis*, are met with also in *Hippolytus's Philosophy*, p. 130, Oxford edition.

³ The brother of Artaxerxes is called *Osthanes*. The name of the Magus *Ostanes* is found also in Tertullian, *De Anima* ("On the Soul"), chap. 57; in Minucius, *Fol.*, chap. 27; in Augustinus, *Contra Donatum*, VI, last chapter; in Eusebius, *Prepar. Evangel.*, IV, p. 119, and Apuleius, *De Magia*, chaps. 27 and 90. In Plinius the manuscripts vary between *Osthanes* and *Ostanes*.

from the Avesta *ushta*, expressing a formula of salutation (comp. *Tîr Yasht*, § 29). The second Gâthâ *Ushtaraiti*, too, begins with the word *ushtâ*. That the Magi were named after this formula of benediction, seems to me to be obvious.

The queer expression *Astrampsychoi*, or *Astrampsychs*, might probably be traced to the purely Avesta name of the third order, viz., the *Vâstryô-fshuyâs* or the farmer. Zarathushtra is explicitly called, in the *Farv. Yt.*, § 89, the chief *Vâstryô-fshuyâs*, and his son *Urvatnara*, who announced in the *Vara* the holy doctrine, is, according to the *Bundahish*, the chief of the farmers. Gobryas is known as a proper name of one of the seven connected with Darius, and it is preserved in the *Behistun-Inscription* IV, 84; V, 7, in the form *Gaubruva*. A similar name is *Gâurrî* in the *Farv. Yt.*, § 118. The *Pazatai*, or Pazatos, may be allied to the Avesta *paiti zan*, a technical term for the reconciliation of the good spirits. Nay, the brother of the Pseudo-Smerdis is called *Patizeithes*, or *Patizeides*, in Herodotus, Bk. III, 61.

The Alexandrian Sotion had written under Ptolemæus Epiphanes (204-181 B. C.) a huge work entitled: *Peri Diadochon tōn Philosophon* ("On the succession of Philosophers"), from which an abstract was made about Olympiad CL by Heraclides Lembus (*vide* Jonsius II, 10). In the twenty-third book of this work Sotion, as Diogenes¹ says, had praised the very ancient wisdom of the Persian Magi, and referred to marriage between consanguineous relations as a custom of the Magi. If we compare the Proem 1 cited from Sotion, with the Proems 6-8, we are led to assume that the whole passage is taken from Sotion (or Aristotle), and that the quotation from Clitarchus is interpolated only by way of parenthesis. It runs thus:—"Those who assert that philosophy has begun from the heathens (and this is done by Sotion according to his Proem 1), explained also separately the methods of it in the heathen nation. They say that the gymnosophists and druids have philosophized in enigmatical sayings. To venerate the good spirits, to do nothing evil, and to show courage, form the contents of their doctrines. That the gymnosophists condemn also death, is said by Clitarchus in his twelfth book. The Chaldæans are occupied also with astronomy and predictions; but the Magi practise the worship of the good spirits, and make offerings and prayers to them, which alone, they asserted, were heard by the deities. They also taught or inquired into the nature and origin of the deities, and considered fire, water, and earth as such. But idols of the gods are condemned by them, particularly by those who fancy the gods to be male and female spirits. They preach also upon justice, and think it illegal to burn dead bodies; nevertheless they permitted consanguineous marriages as Sotion says in the twenty-third

¹ Proem 1:—"Some say that the work of philosophy began with the heathens. There were the Magi among the Persians, Chaldæans, and Babylonians or Assyrians, the gymnosophists among the Indians, the so-called druids and semotheists among the Celts and Galatians, according to the testimony of Aristotle in his *Magika*, and of Sotion in the twenty-third book of the *Diadoche*." Comp. *ibid* 7.

book. They practise also mantology and prediction, asserting that the good spirits are seen by them. And the air, according to their opinion, is also full of forms perceptible to the eyes of sharp-sighted persons by means of evaporation. They forbid the wearing of gold and ornaments. Their dress is white; their couch is the soil; their food is vegetables, cheese, and simple bread; their staff a cane with which they pierce the cheese to take it up and eat it. Yet mantical sorcery is quite unknown to them as is stated by Aristotle in the *Magikos*, and by Dino in the fifth book of his History."

We observe here a series of points confirmed, which we have found already in Xanthus, Herodotus, and Dino. We cannot better describe the nature of the Magi than by calling it an occupation *theōn therapeiui, thusiai*, and *euchai* "with divine service, sacrifice, and prayer." As to the conceptions (see above) of the *yazatas* of fire and water, they resemble that of the earth, the *Armaiti* of the Avesta texts. It is literally incorrect to say that the Magi knew no male and female *yazatas*, if we are permitted to consider as old Magian deities *Mithra* and *Anāhita* for example, who are quite certainly male and female beings. Moreover, it is true that the Magi knew no divine propagations or generations, and genealogies like the Greeks. The appearance of the *yazatas* is sufficiently confirmed by the Avesta texts; but those *eidola* or forms which are visible to sharp-eyed persons, are probably the *Fravashis*; however, they are apparently too materialistic in their conception. The statement as regards the food of the Magi reminds us of what is related about Zoroaster that he had lived for a long time on cheese¹.

I conclude with Hermippus this remarkable list of the Greek authors who lived before Christ. That an author of this name had written a work on the Magi which contained several books, has been remarked above (p. 279) on the authority of a passage quoted there from Diogenes. Regarding the contents of this work we are indebted to Plinius,² whose words will soon occupy our attention. Who this Hermippus was, or when he lived, is nowhere mentioned. Notwithstanding this, *Hermippos Kallimacheios* has been considered nearly unanimously, and not without reason, as the writer of the book on the Magi (see Jonsius, *De Script. Hist. Phil.* II, 9, 3; and Lozynski, *Hermippi Fragmenta*, p. 46). Because it is very probable that a learned man like Hermippus, who had occupied himself so much with the History of Philosophy (I refer only to his work on the "Seven Sages of Greece"), should have also written a work on the Magi after so many excellent preparatory labours. This Hermippus, the disciple of the celebrated Callimachus (who lived when very old under Ptolemæus Energetes, and who died about 240

¹ Plinius, *Hist. Nat.*, XI, 42, 97:—"They relate that Zoroaster lived in the desert for 30 years on cheese, and so temperately as not to feel old age." Compare Porphyrios "On Abstinence," IV, 16, p. 348 *seq.*

² *Hist. Nat.*, XXX, 1, 2:—"Hermippus, who wrote very accurately on this art (of magic), and explained 2,000,000 verses composed by Zoroaster, and who made also an index of the volumes, has related that Agonaces was the teacher by whom he (Zoroaster) was informed, and that he had lived 5,000 years before the war of Troy."

B. C.), had displayed his great literary activity in the second part of the third century before Christ; and since he mentions the death of Chrysippus (who died in 207 B. C.), his last works must belong to the end of the third century. Probably he is identical with the Peripatetician Hermippus cited by Hieronymus in *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*.

Müller (*vide* his *Historia Græcorum Fragmentorum*, "History of Greek Fragments," III, p. 36), on the contrary, differs from the common opinion, according to which Hermippus, the disciple of Callimachus, wrote the book *Peri Magon* ("On the Magi"), and ascribes that work to one *Hermippos o astrologikos*. "Hermippus the Astrologer," who seems to be alluded to in Athenæus,¹ and who has also written *Phainόμενα*. Yet Müller avers that this astrologer Hermippus must have been contemporary with the Callimachian, and that both might also be identical; so the question, whether the two Hermippi are one and the same person or not, is without any importance as to the age of the book in question.

If the statement of Hermippus concerning Persian matters is obscure and uncertain in Athenæus, another quotation from the former in Arnobius² is no less so. Whether the statement expressed by the words: *quis super*.

¹ *Hist. Nat.*, p. 478 a:—"Nicomachus says in the first book on the Egyptian festivals:—The drinking cup is Persian (the next two lines are very obscure) from which the wonders and fruitful things on earth come forth." Casaubonus corrects the text [the language being obscure]. Pursan reads it quite otherwise:—"Was like the world of which Hermippus the philosopher says that the wonders of gods, etc." I must acknowledge that I doubt very much whether the name of Hermippus is here in its right place. I believe that we have here the name of some astrological vessel (or instrument) . . . "it was an astrological tripod like the world." The word *kundu* is used (in Genesis, xlv, 2,4,12, in the *Septuagint*) of the drinking cup of Joseph. Or we must read it thus:—"In the beginning was, as says Hermippus, an astrological world." Certainly it appears to me very doubtful whether the predicate 'astrological' refers to Hermippus. According to Anquetil, *Usages*, T. II, p. 533, the water vessel used in the liturgy is called in Guzarati *kouri* [rather "*kundi*"]. Sanskrit *kandu*, "an iron pan."

² *Adversus Gentes* ("Against the Heathens") I, chap. 52, p. 31, ed. Lugd.:—"There may now come (here there are great variations in the manuscripts) on the fiery way from the interior path the Magian Zoroaster, the Bactrianus, as the author Hermippus calls him; may he come to the meeting, whose deeds are recounted by Ctesias in the first book of his *History*; Armenius, the nephew of Zostrianus, and Pamphilus, the friend of Cyrus; Apollonius, Damigero and Dardanus, Velus Julianus and Bæbulus, and any other person who is said to have excelled in these things." Instead of *Zostrianus*, which occurs in the MSS., some editors read the word *Ostanis*. They are followed by Lozynski and Müller too. They (as well as Oehler and Orelli) have a punctuation after *auctori*, and connect the word *Bactrianus* with the following *Bactrianus et ille*. Desid. Heraldis in his *Animadv. ad Arnobius* p. 52, would read thus:—"There may now come some Magian Azonaces from the interior orbit; so that we assent to the author Hermippus, that the Bactrian also may come." This Bactrian is, in his opinion, Zoroaster, whose name, he imagines, was first written on the margin and thus found its way into the first sentence.—The words: *Armenius Zostriani nepos et familiaris Pamphilus Cyri*, ("Armenius, the nephew of Zostrianus, and Pamphilus, the friend of Cyrus") are, I think, corrupt. They refer to the Her mentioned above. Perhaps we should read: *Armenii filius Zoroastri nepos et familia Pamphilus Herus*, ("a nephew of Armenius, the son of Zoroaster, and Her, a Pomphylian by birth") I see that a similar conjecture has already been made by Cotelier in *Recogn. Clement*, IV,

igneum zonam magus interiore ab orbe Zoroastres, "which Magus over a fiery zone from the inner orbit was Zoroaster"—the meaning of which I cannot understand!—is testified to by Hermippus, or (if *Bactrianus* belongs to the first part of the sentence) whether the origin of Zoroaster was from Bactria, is doubtful; the former, however, is more probable. It perhaps alludes to what the later Greek fabulists narrate concerning the death of Zoroaster by lightning and the preservation of the fire glowing in ashes, as a symbol of dominion.

We will, however, go back to the passage of Plinius, in order to learn more certain data about the work of Hermippus. Herein three things are related of Hermippus: (1) that he placed Zoroaster three thousand years before the Trojan war, wherein he agrees more or less with other Greek authors; (2) that he called Agonaces (an obscure name) the teacher of Zoroaster; and (3) that the manuscripts of Plinius have the variants: *Agonaccen, Agoneten Aganacen, Abonacem*.

27 (*Patres Apostolici*, I. p. 512), who reads: *Armenius Zostriani nepos et familiaris Pamphylus Her*, "Armenius, the nephew of Zostrianus and the Pamphilian Her, his friend." Zostrianus is mentioned by Porphyrius in his *Life of Plato*.—The Bactrian Zoroaster is mentioned by Arnobius in another passage too (chap. I. p. 5):—"Is it also to be laid to our charge that one day under Ninus and Zoroaster as their chiefs the Assyrians and Bactrians fought against each other not only with swords and forces, but also with the magical and mysterious art of the Chaldeans?" Evidently Oxyartes is here meant, the king of Bactria, who is mentioned in Diodorus Siculus II, 6, as succumbing to Ninus after a valorous resistance.—Eusebius, *Chron.* II, p. 35, ed. Auch. (concerning the seventh year of Abraham) says:—"There is some Zoroaster the Magian, who is reckoned a famous king of Bactria, against whom Ninus fought."—Eusebius, *Prep. Evangel.* X, 9: "According to whom Zoroaster the Magian reigned over the Bactrians."

We find the same Magian and King of the Bactrians in Moses of Chorene. Theo Pro-gymnast in the book on "Comparisons," says:—"For, if Tomyris, is stronger than Cyrus, or Semiramis stronger than the Bactrian Zoroaster, we must not, therefore, conclude that a female is stronger than a male." *Justinus, Hist.* I. 1.

1 Arnobius, *Adv. Gent.* I, 52:—"The codex has, according to Oehler, the words *quae super* "which above"; *quis super* "who above", in Orelli, Lozynski, and Müller; *quae super* "I pray through" is a conjecture of Salmasius, adopted by Oehler. The words: *super igneam zonam magus interiore ab orbe Zoroastres*, "above the fiery zone from the interior circle the Magus Zoroaster," are very obscure. *Igneae zona*, "the fiery zone," has been considered by Salmasius as the Libyan (or African) glowing zone, which is impossible. *Interiore ab orbe*, "from the inner orbit," might perhaps mean "from the central orbit," in opposition to *Bactrianus*; but it might also denote the inner magical circle out of which Zoroaster comes from the burning mountain through fire, or above the fire-circle. Then we have to compare the passage in Dio Chrysostom in his "Borysthenian Oration" (see below), and in this case we should have Hermippus bearing testimony to this fiery apparition. Or *interiore ab orbe* might perhaps refer to the opinion which represents Zoroaster as an offspring of the Greeks (see *supra* the Scholiast of Plato), or *igneae zona* is perhaps a translation of *Atropatene*, or *Aderbijdn*, *Atropatene* originally signifying the fire-land. Strabo, XI, p. 523, derives the name of this province, which he calls *Atropatene* or *Atropatia*, from *Atropates* who had preserved this province from the Macedonian dominion. *Áthrô-páti* means in Avesta "the master of the fire," or *áthrô-páta* "the protector of the fire," or "he who is protected by fire," or as in the *Fav. Yt.* § 102, one of the sons of Vishtâspa so called. In the Bundahish the country is called *Átrô (Atân)-pâtkân*. The birth of Zarathushtra is said to have taken place at Urmi in Atropatene.

Agoneiscen, which sufficiently prove that the passage in question is corrupted. Since the Avesta texts and tradition know no other teacher of Zoroaster than Ahura-Mazda Himself, I assume that Hermippus rendered the name *Oromazes* or *Oromasdes* in some form corresponding to the Avesta, perhaps *Agoramazdes*, giving the Avesta *h* by the Greek *g*, or perhaps only *Agomazes*. If this hypothesis is correct, it proves the independent investigation of Hermippus and his knowledge of the (Avesta) language. The Greeks knew right well that Ahura-Mazda Himself was the teacher of Zoroaster; for in no other way must the Platonian words *Zoroastres o tou Oromázēs*, "Zoroaster the Disciple of Oromázēs," be understood, as the explanation of the scholiasts correctly indicates; and, moreover, we have the explicit assertion of Plutarch¹ who derived from the best sources whatever he said as to the Magi, for he says in his Life of Numa that the Deity had intercourse with Zoroaster.

The third thing asserted by Hermippus, according to Plinius, is regarding the existence and number of Zoroastrian writings, which were known to Hermippus, and illustrated by him with a synopsis of the contents of the several books. It is evident that the word *explanavit* ("he has explained") must not be urged, or taken to mean "translated." This expression is rather used to elucidate what is obscure and uncertain. Most probably Hermippus became acquainted with a synopsis of the contents of the twenty-one Nasks of the Avesta. The contents of one of these nasks are still surviving, and Lassen² has excellently indicated a parallel between the expression "the twenty-fold composition or interpretation of 100,000 verses" and these Nasks, which correspond to the twenty-one words of the prayer: *Yathâ ahû vairyô*. Only a small remnant of these Nasks has been preserved. The whole mass must have been very numerous. In the register given by Anquetil and Vullers ("Fragments of the Religion of Zoroaster," p. 15) 825 chapters on the whole are indicated of the 21 Nasks; the smallest having 17, the largest 65 chapters. For the Vendidad 22 chapters are correctly stated, and we have no reason to doubt of the accuracy of the other numbers.

In the edition of Spiegel these 22 chapters of the Vendidad have about 4,485 lines, each chapter, therefore, having about 205. In the lithographed codex of the *Vendidad Sâde* there are 560 pages, of which a little more than the half, i.e., 292 pages belong to the Vendidad. Each page in it has 19 lines, and the whole book amounts to 5,548 lines, consequently each chapter has on average 252 lines. If the volumes described by Hermippus were perhaps in form and handwriting of the same extent as that codex (we may believe that in an older time they were still larger, grander, and more extensive); and if we assume that the same average is applicable for all the 825 chapters

¹ Num. c. 4 :—"While agreeing in this, is it worth while not to believe that the Deity conversed with Zaleucus and Minos and Zoroaster and Numa and Lycurgus, who had governed empires and established kingdoms? Or is it probable that the gods have earnest intercourse with these men to instruct and admonish them in what is best, but that with poets and lyric warblers such dealings as they have are only in sport?"

² *Indische Altertumskunde* "Indian Antiquities," III, p. 440 note.

very cautious with respect to the informations of later authors, when their statements do not expressly refer to those older documents, or at least cannot be traced to them with some probability.

Among the authors of the period of the Roman Empire, the first place is taken up by Strabo. He draws a parallel¹ between the Magi and the Indian philosophers, saying that the former gave instruction like the latter in divine things. In another passage he describes them as a tribe of the Persian people, and calls them zealous students of a holy life. That the Magi were of *one* tribe, although not of the Persian, is stated in the Bundahish, p. 79, l. 12, where it is said that Maidhyômah, the cousin of Zarathushtra, had first adopted the holy doctrine, and that all Mobads of Persia are to be traced back to the family of Manushchithra (Minúchehr).

The detailed description of the Persian customs and religion, given by Strabo² in the same book, is partly based on autopsy, and partly on the testimony of other historians. We must consider the whole passage which runs as follows³ :—

“The Persians do not erect any statues or altars. They offer sacrifices on an elevated place, thinking the heaven to be Zeus. They venerate also the Sun (whom they call Mithra), the Moon, the Aphrodite, fire, earth, winds and water. They offer sacrifices also in a pure place with prayers, standing near the garlanded animal which is to be immolated” (or “standing garlanded near the victim,” if we read with Herodotus *estemmenoi* “garlanded”), and when the Magus who performs the holy act has cut the flesh into pieces, they distribute and give it away without offering any portion of it to God, for God wishes for the soul of the animal sacrificed, and nothing else. Nevertheless, they lay, as some say, a small portion of the intestines (or fat) on the fire.”

Trojan people existed.” Hence it follows that Lactantius placed this Hystaspes a long time before the foundation of Rome, and consequently before Darius Hystaspes. Justinus, *Apol.*, I, 20, says :—“Sibylla, as well as Hystaspes, said that the perishable things will be destroyed by fire.” *Ibid.*, c. 44 : “By the energy of the evil gods death was constituted, as is stated by those who read the books of Hystaspes and Sibylla and the Prophets, that through fear they might turn aside men who were attaining to a knowledge of the good, and keep them in bondage to themselves, which thing at the end they were made to effect.” Justinus wrote this apology about 151 years before Christ.

The contents of the work were, as it seems, to the following effect :—Hystaspes had a dream about things to come, which was interpreted to him by a prophetic boy. In this was a description of the son of God, and how the kings of this earth persecuted him ; besides the decay of the Roman Empire and the destruction of the world in fire. According to the context of *Apology*, I, 44, the book must also have treated of the fate of man after death.—The book must have been known at any rate in the first century before Christ.

¹ XV, p. 717 :—“They are informed about divine things (by the philosophers of India) as the Persians by the Magi,” *Ibid.*, p. 727 :—“In that country there live tribes called *Patishorsie*, and *Achaimenidai* and the *Magoi* ; these latter are devoted to a pious life.”

² XV, p. 733 :—“The former we have seen ourselves, the latter you can read in histories.”

³ XV, p. 732.

Hitherto we have an abridged extract from Herodotus, which I think wants correction here and there (Herodotus I, 131-133). The words "whom they call Mithra," are an incorrect addition made by Strabo, who following the opinions of his time, confounded Mithra with the Sun. He is right, however, in dropping the words of Herodotus : *oute pur ánakaiousi* "neither do they illumine fire." The concluding portion beginning from the words "for the soul," is a singular and quite certainly an authentic insertion taken from another source.

"In a different manner," continues Strabo, "they sacrifice to fire and water ; certainly to the fire by depositing dry wood without the bark, and laying some fat upon this wood. Then they kindle it and add fuel to it not blowing but fanning it. They kill those who blow out the fire, or lay a corpse or anything dead or filthy, on the fire. They sacrifice to the water by going up to a lake, river or fountain, where they form a ditch, into which they kill the animal, taking care that nothing of the neighbouring water gets bloody, and causes thereby any contamination. Afterwards they dismember the flesh and place it on myrtle or laurel, and the Magi touch it with fine staves, singing, pouring out oil mixed with milk and honey, not into the fire nor into the water, but on the soil, and while they are singing they hold for a long time a bunch of fine tamarisk-twigs." We observe that here, too, Strabo follows Herodotus. Whilst he abridged his statement before, he now enlarges, as I believe he does, upon what he has seen himself or borrowed from first rate sources. The laying on of dry wood to venerate the fire (*Vend.*, Farg. XIV, 2-3 ; XVIII, 19), the strict prohibition against putting dead or impure objects on fire, or of mixing it with water, the classical description of the *baresma* (vide *supra* the passage of Dino), and the long hymns connected with its gathering—all these things are completely confirmed by the Avesta texts. The oil here spoken of may doubtless be identified with the *haoma* juice, which was mixed with milk. Honey, too, is mentioned in the Avesta, if according to my supposition in the discourse on "Mithra," p. 72, the *madhu* employed in offerings does not mean "wine," but "honey."

What now follows especially refers to Cappadocian Magism, and we are fully entitled to consider it as an account of what the Cappadocian Strabo had seen with his own eyes.

"But in Cappadocia where there is a large number of Magi who are called fire-burners or fire-priests, and where there are many sacred places of Persian deities, they do not sacrifice with the sword, but they strike with a log of wood as with a club. There are also fire-burning places, certain remarkable inclosures, in the midst of which stands an altar full of ashes, on which the Magi preserve inextinguishable fire ; daily they enter it, and sing for nearly an hour, holding a bundle of *baresma* before the fire, their heads covered with cocked tiaras, which go down on both sides so far as to touch the lips. The same thing is customary in the temples of Anais and Omanus. They, also, have enclosures, and the picture of Omanus is borne in a procession. These things

we have now seen, but those previously mentioned are related in historical books just like the following."

"The Persians do not make water in a river, nor do they wash or bathe in it, nor cast into it dead bodies or whatever produces contamination. They always first adore the Fire before making an offering to any other deity."

After mentioning several features of private life, which are partly related by Herodotus, too, Strabo continues :—"They inter corpses surrounded with wax ; but the Magi are not interred. The latter are suffered to be devoured by birds (from Herodotus) ; . . ."

Strabo gives us here a most accurate description of the Magian fire-hearths and the divine service connected with them, such as is described in the original texts. He translates the Avesta word *âthrava*¹ very accurately with the Gr. *puraitlios* "fire-hearth," and the Pers. *âtashgâhs* with the Gr. *puraitheia* "fire-temples."² To the description of the *barsam* he adds here that of the *paiti-dâna* (*Vend.*, Farg. XIV, § 8 ; *Abân Yt.*, § 123) or *penom*. Of Anâhita and Omanus I have treated in another discourse, and I can, therefore, pass over the Strabonian passages concerning them, and also those about Mithra.

So we have a testimony as to the whole offering service of the Magi, and the prayers and songs used in it, which confirms the holy texts no less than it is confirmed by these texts to the minutest point.

Still another feature has been preserved by the geographer Strabo³ in describing the Bactrians :—"Their customs have been somewhat milder than those of the Sogdians ; but of them also many evil things are recounted by Onesicritus and his followers, as for example, those who are debilitated by old age or sickness are thrown by them (*i.e.*, the Bactrians) before living dogs which are fed expressly for this purpose, and which are called in their languages 'buriers in solitude' (Gr. *entaphaiastas*). The place outside the wall of the capital of the Bactrians appears clean ; but inside every place is filled with human bones."

Strabo mentions as his authority Onesicritus of Assypelæna, a writer of the time of Alexander, who is certainly not regarded as a great authority. Nevertheless, what he states here is true in itself, though painted in too striking colours. Porphyrius also⁴ mentions the facts, and the later Agathias⁵ enlarges upon this subject describing how the ceremony was performed by the Magi in his time :—"If people of lower rank in the army fall victims to any bad disease," says he, "they are brought away from the city while living and conscious ; and when a soldier is exposed in this way, a piece of bread, water,

¹ *Gen.* *athaurunô* ; dat. *athaurunê* ; acc. *âthravanem*.

² In the Bundahish (p. 40, l. 20) *Atûn (âtrô) gâs* "the fire-place." The *dâityô gâtush* of the fire is found in the eighth Fargard of the Vendidad.

³ XI, p. 517.

⁴ "On Abstinence," IV, 21 :—"The Hyrcanians cast living persons before devouring birds and dogs, the Caspians dead persons. The Bactrians cast old men living before dogs."

⁵ II. 23, p. 114, ed. Bonn.

and a stick are placed by him. As long as he is able to eat of the bread, and has strength enough, he drives away with the stick the approaching animals, and repels the hungry guests. If his life is not yet fully extinct, but he has grown so invalid as to be unable to move his hands, the beasts devour the unhappy man who is half famished and already rattling in his throat, and deprive him of the hope at any rate of escaping from his illness. For many have already recovered and come back to their homes as one in a theatre or a tragedy arrives from the gates of darkness, emaciated and meagre enough to terrify persons meeting them. If some one returns home, all turn aside from him, and run away from him as though he were contaminated in the highest degree, and as though they were still with the infectious dead. He is not allowed to partake of the ordinary manner of living before he is purified by the Magi from the contamination of the expected death, and before he has as it were regained fresh life."

According to Agathias, people of the lower ranks were treated in this way, who in the army contracted evil maladies. According to Onesicritus, sick and old people in general were so treated. The Avesta texts, however, confine this treatment to those who bear corpses (singly), and contaminate themselves by doing so. The *Vendidad*, Farg. III, § 15, says :—"What shall be the place of the man who bears corpses [alone] ?"—"Thereupon Ahura Mazda answered :—'Wherever the earth is most waterless, treeless, cleanest, driest, and the least passed through by cattle and team, and by the fire of Ahura Mazda, and by the *baresma* spread in purity, and by the faithful man.'"—(16) "How far from the fire ? How far from the pure or clean water ? How far from the spread *baresma* ? How far from the faithful man ?" (17) "Thereupon Ahura Mazda answered :—'Thirty steps from the fire, thirty steps from the water, thirty steps from the spread *baresma*, thirty steps from the faithful man.' (18-19) 'Thus the Mazdayasnians shall there erect an enclosure, and therein shall these Mazdayasnians bring the coarsest food, therein shall these Mazdayasnians bring the most worn clothes ; such food he shall eat, such clothes he shall put on ; so long as he grows old and sick, and quite invalid.' (20) 'But when he has grown old or sick, and quite invalid, the strongest, swiftest, and most skilful Mazdayasnians are to lead him on a mountain, and to cut his head off from the breadth of his back, and deliver his corpse to the hungry and corpse-devouring creatures of the Holy Genius, i.e., to the birds *kahrkâsa*, saying : This man here repents of all evil thoughts, words and deeds, and if he has done other vicious deeds, he is pardoned (by his repentance) ; but if he has done no other vicious deeds, this man is absolved by his repentance for ever and ever.'"

Hence we observe that the *Greeks did not fully understand the Persian practice*, or exaggerated this kind of interpretation ; unless the practice had been more cruel than the law. It is important for us to know that from the time of Alexander to the sixth century after Christ this strange custom of the Magi, as contained in the original texts, had been fully verified.

Plinius (living 23-79 years after Christ) had, in his great work on "Natural History," frequent opportunities of speaking upon magic, the Magi, and Zoroaster. In his first book, in which he enumerates the sources and contents of all books (*Tomē* 1, p. 87 ed. Sill), he cites Endoxus, Aristotle, and Hermippus among the extraneous authorities for his thirtieth book, wherein the well-known passage about the Magi is found. And in this thirtieth book itself (1, 2) he again refers to these authorities, particularly Hermippus. So we are fully justified in ascribing to Hermippus those notes on the Magi and Zoroaster, which are given by Plinius without specially mentioning his authority.

Besides those passages in Plinius, which have just been mentioned in Endoxus, Aristotle, and Hermippus, we have here to dilate upon that passage¹ wherein he calls Osthane, the companion of Xerxes in Greece, the first writer on magic, who had sown the seeds of this marvellous art wherever he went. But further on he states that a short time before this Osthane another Zoroaster of Proconnesus had lived as some trustworthy writers have related. Osthane had awakened an ardent desire for learning this wisdom among the Greeks. There were also a tribe of the Magi who were descended from the Jews, *viz.*, Moses, Jannes, and Lotapea (*Hitopata*) who lived many thousand years after Zoroaster. What is called the Cyprian magical art flourished still later. In the time of Alexander, too, a second Osthane, as pre-eminent as his companion, had given no small importance to this art. I have treated of this Osthane in another discourse. According to Plinius, there can be no doubt as to the reality of his person and books. We wish that Plinius had more enlarged on the Proconnesian Zoroaster, and on those *diligentiores* "more zealous persons," who had adhered to him.

The Miletian colony on the island of Proconnesus in the Propontis, may be traced back to very high antiquity; for Herodotus (*vide* Bk. IV, 15) places Aristæas of Proconnesus 340 years before his time, that is, in the beginning of the eighth century before Christ, or, if the reading *diekosioisi* is correct, in the beginning of the seventh century. The miraculous story of Aristæas is related by Herodotus: he died at a tanner's house, who had shut him up in his shop, and announced his death to his relations; that he had been seen by some one while on his route to Cyzicus, and had not been found either living or dead

¹ *Hist. Nat.*, XXX, 1, 2:—"As far as I can find, one Osthane, who accompanied Xerxes on his campaign in Greece, first wrote about it (*viz.*, witchcraft). He sowed the seeds of this miraculous art wherever he went, and the world was infected wherever they reached; but some very accurate authors state that Zoroaster, another Proconnesian, lived a short time before him. It is certain that this Osthane chiefly excited the Greek nation to that pitch (not of eagerness but of frenzy) for this art, although I see that in the earliest time, and nearly always, the greatest literary glory and excellence was sought in this art.—There is also another magical sect depending on the Jews: Moses, Jannes and Lotapea; but it was many thousand years after Zoroaster; still younger is the Cyprian (art). In the period of Alexander the Great, great importance was given to this art by a second Osthane who had the honour of accompanying him (Alexander), and of peregrinating with him in the whole world."

on opening the workshop ; that he had reappeared seven years afterwards in Proconnesus, had composed some poem entitled *Arimaspi*, and disappeared a second time. Three hundred and forty years after this second disappearance he appeared again in Metapontus and ordered an altar to be built to Apollo, and a statue to be erected on the side of it bearing the name *Proconnesius Aristetas*, for Apollo had come to them alone in Italy, and he now being Aristetas, had then followed that god in the shape of a raven¹—and after that he had disappeared. Strabo also mentions him (XXII, p. 589), speaking of Proconnesus :—" Here," he says, " was born Aristetas, the author of the *Arimaspian Epos* (*cfr.* 1., p. 21 ; Plinius VII, 2, 2), a magician (*anèr goes*) if there was any magician in the world." In the XIV p. 639, he mentions the opinion of some writers, that Aristetas the Proconnesian had been the teacher of Homer. Origenes in his work *Adversus Celsum*, III, 26 *seq.*, relates the whole story of Aristetas from Herodotus. He adds the name Pindar, too, as one of his authorities.

We gather from this narrative that Proconnesus was a seat of mystical things, and it is possible that just as Er, son of Armenius, who revived on the funeral pile, happened to be transformed into Zoroaster, so the reviving Aristetas gave origin to the story of the Proconnesian Zoroaster. What is said by Plinius about the two Osthanes, may well be connected with the " succession of the Magi," which has been treated of above. There can be no doubt that his determination of the chronology by placing Moses and the Egyptian magicians (of the Christian Bible, *cfr.* II, Timotheus 3, 8) many thousand years after Zoroaster, is an exaggeration, even if we suppose that Zoroaster lived 5,000 years before the Trojan War.

Plinius² commemorates two remarkable features of the life of Zoroaster, one of which he refers to his birth, *viz.*, he laughed on the day he was born, and his cerebellum palpitated so as to push back the hand laid upon it, a pre-sage of future knowledge. The next feature is the life of Zoroaster in the desert.³ He had lived there for thirty years on cheese prepared in a way that his old age could not be marked. The first feature is also found in the *Zartusht Nâmah*, chapter VI ; the second is likewise confirmed by the original texts on the life of Zoroaster in the desert already spoken of elsewhere, as well as by the passages of Eubulus in Porphyrius, which refer to it, and of Dio Chrysostom. Plutarch,⁴ too, mentions that Zoroaster lived on food made of milk.

¹ Plinius VII, 52, 53 :—" Also (the soul) of Aristetas had been seen flying out of his mouth in the image of a raven."

² *Hist. Nat.*, VII, 16, 15 :—" We have heard that Zoroaster was the only man *who laughed on the same day on which he was born* ; his cerebellum is said to have palpitated so much as to push back the hand laid on it—a proof of his future knowledge."

³ *Hist. Nat.*, XI, 42, 97 :—" They recount that Zoroaster lived for 30 years on cheese so moderately as not to feel old age."

⁴ *Quæst. Sympos.*, IV, 1, p. 660 :—" I do not remember, said Philo, that Philinus adduces to us Sosaster, who is said to have used no other beverage or food, but to have lived on milk during all his life."

In the thirty-seventh book of Plinius there is a series of quotations from the book of Zoroaster : *Peri Lithon*, mentioned by Suidas. In the eighteenth book, §§ 24, 56, there is a statement of Zoroaster about sowing, and in the twenty-eighth, 6, 19, some dogma about the *gomez* (" the consecrated cow's urine ").

As far as we can rely upon the extracts made by Eusebius¹ from Alexander Polyhistor, and by the latter from Berossus, the contemporary of Alexander, this Chaldæan writer has placed after the deluge a set of eighty-six kings in Babylon, the two first of whom were Euechius and Chomasbelus (to the former he gives four *neri*, to the latter four *neri* and five *sossi*), and who are said to have reigned 33,091 years. After this the Medians (it is related) had taken Babylon, and then eight Median tyrants had reigned 224 years, whose names have been preserved by Berossus ; afterwards eleven kings (" 48 years " stands on the margin of the manuscript ; Gutschmidt supposes 248) ; then forty-nine Chaldæan kings for 458 years ; then nine Arab kings for 245 years. Then he has related the story of Semiramis who had reigned over the Assyrians, and then explicitly again the names of 45 kings who had reigned for a period of 526 years. Afterwards Phul had been the king of the Chaldæans. Whereas the kings who reigned in succession immediately after the deluge, prove by the reckoning by *sari*, *neri*, and *sossi*, and by the immense number of years, to be a mythical supplement of a period of 36,000 years. The Median rulers over Babylon and the kings who followed them down to Phul, seem to be historical facts ; and learned men of modern times place the commencement of the Median dynasty 2,458 or 2,447 years before Christ. As the first of these eight Median kings mentioned by Berossus, Syncellus² (who lived about 800 years after Christ) names a Zoroaster. In this statement he follows, as he says, the opinion of Alexander Polyhistor. From the words of Syncellus it likewise follows that Panodorus, too, calls Zoroaster the first king, and ascribes to him astronomical calculations. If we consider only the contradiction between the Polyhistor of Eusebius, who evidently distinguishes the eighty-six kings from the Medians, and the Polyhistor of Syncellus who enumerates those eighty-six kings among the Median rulers, but afterwards designates Zoroaster and the seven kings after him as Chaldæans, and gives them 190 solar years, whilst the Polyhistor of Eusebius reckons 224 (or 234) years, we must aver

¹ *Chron.* I., p. 40 *seq.*

² *Chronograph.* T. I, p. 147. ed. Bonn :—" From this time " (the year of the world 2405) " the same Polyhistor introduces eighty-six Chaldæan kings (the two first of them Euechius and Chomasbelus), and eighty-four Median kings ; but Zoroaster and the seven Chaldæan kings after him are said to have reigned during 107 solar years, not during *sari* and *neri* and *sossi* and other nonsensical mythical terms, but for solar years. For mythologists thinking earlier kings to be gods or demi-gods, and leading their successors into error, make them to have reigned during an infinite time, believing that the world existed from eternity, in contrast with the Holy Scripture. The later kings, on the contrary, who are known to everybody, being mortals were represented as reigning during solar years, and not, as it seems to Panodorus and some others, because the years of the kings were at last measured by solar years, since the solar years were calculated by Zoroaster from the years of Enoch,"

that either the text of Syncellus is corrupt, or that he has himself made arbitrary alterations. It is, therefore, also problematical whether Alexander Polyhistor and his authority Berosus had actually called the first of the Median tyrants Zoroaster, or whether it is an interpolation of the later writers. It is not at all certain that this Median Zoroaster, who reigned over Babylon, was the celebrated prophet of this name, and if we admit the correctness of the statement of Syncellus, it is not improbable that several persons have had the name of Zarathushtra. We have a proof of this in the statements of the Chroniclers as to one Zoroaster having been king of the Bactrians and reputed as a contemporary of Ninus and Semiramis. According to the Armenian translation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius,¹ Cephalion has related that the Assyrians first ruled over Asia. He has also treated of Ninus and his achievements, of the birth of Semiramis, of the Magus Zaravesht, King of Bactria, of his war against and defeat by Semiramis. Ninus, Cephalion says, reigned 52 years, after him Semiramis 42 years. The latter surrounded Babylon by a wall, and then undertook the unluckly war against India. Syncellus² (I, p. 315) abbreviates and, as it seems, disfigures this passage, provided his text is not corrupted. For whilst Eusebius makes Cephalion state the age of Ninus to be 52 years, Syncellus places the birth of Semiramis and Zoroaster in the fifty-second year of Ninus, which is evidently absurd. Moreover, *etei* "in the year" is an emendation of Scaliger; the manuscripts having *ete te* "years and." Somewhat differing information concerning the Magus Zoroaster, the contemporary of Semiramis, is given by Moses of Chorene (I, p. 87, Venice edition). Semiramis, he says, as she spent the summer in Armenia, made the Magus and Median ruler Zradasht governor of Assyria and Niniveh, consequently she became his enemy and attacked him; but she fled before him into Armenia, and afterwards Ninyas killed her and took possession of her empire. Moses of Chorene is here expressly attacking the addition of Cephalion. The latter relates, as many others, first the birth of Semiramis, then her war against Zoroaster in which Semiramis was conqueror, and, lastly, the Indian campaign. Maribas of Catina, he says, has drawn the facts from Chaldaean sources, which

¹ I. p. 43., ed. Auch:—"I begin to relate what others also have recounted, principally the story of Hellenicus the Leshian, and Ctesias the Cnidian, then Herodotus the Halicarnassian. At first there reigned in Asia the Assyrians, of whom the first was Ninus, the son of Belus, during whose time very many and very splendid achievements had been performed.' Further on he adds the birth of Semiramis and a narrative of the combat and defeat of the Magus Zoroaster, King of Bactria, by Semiramis; and that Ninus had reigned for 52 years and then died. After Ninus reigned Semiramis, and fortified Babylon in the form which has been described by many authors, viz., Ctesias and Zeno and Herodotus and some writers after them. Then he relates that Semiramis waged a war against the Indians but was defeated and put to flight, etc."

² "I begin to relate (just as before) 52 years. (The manuscripts have *Zoroastrobatu* 'instead of Zoroaster.' *Zoroastru magu* 'of the Magus Zoroaster' has been conjectured by Scaliger; perhaps we should read instead *Bactrianu*). After him, he says, Semiramis fortified Babylon in the form related by many, viz., by Ctesias, Zeno (Müller reads *Dino*), Herodotus and the writers after them; and her campaign in India and her defeat," etc.

are confirmed by the Armenian tradition. Next he continues (I, p. 39):—“A certain Zradasht, a Magian and King of Bactria, that is Media, says, that *Zervan* was the beginning and father of the deities; and many other things he has fabled about him which cannot be repeated here.”

Let us go back to Cephalion, whose age we regret cannot be determined (Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, III, p. 68 and p. 625). He expressly names Ctesias among his authorities. We must, therefore, trace back to Ctesias the whole story of the war of Semiramis against Zoroaster so much the more, since it is also found in Diodorus, though under another name. The latter relates the conquests of Ninus (Bk. II, 2 *seq.*), wherein he expressly cites Ctesias, and says that Bactria alone resisted him. Further, that he then delayed the war against Bactria and founded Niniveh in the meanwhile. After that by way of episode (in chapters IV and V) the birth of Semiramis is asserted, as Diodorus states in harmony with Cephalion (in chapter V:—“But what tradition says about the birth of Semiramis is this”). Then follow the preparations for war made by Ninus, his invasion of Bactria, the stratagem of Semiramis by which the town was taken, the marriage of Semiramis and Ninus, the birth of Ninyas, and the death of the founder of Niniveh; then the foundation of Babylon by Semiramis, her expedition into India, and her death. We clearly observe that whatever is quoted from Cephalion, is only a dry and much shortened synopsis of the contents of what is related more diffusely from Ctesias, by Diodorus. Yet Diodorus, in following Ctesias, calls the King of Bactria *Oxyartes*, without hinting any how at his identity with the Magian Zoroaster, whilst Cephalion, according to the authority of Eusebius, Moses of Chorene, and Syncellus taken from the *same* Ctesias, designates the Magian Zoroaster as the Bactrian King in question. Considering that Cephalion is little trustworthy, we might be led to conjecture that he had, on his own account, altered the *Oxyartes* of Ctesias into *Zoroaster*. But many reasons controvert this hypothesis:—Firstly, the Maribas, the authority of Moses, has also related of the Magian *Zradasht* and his combat with Semiramis. Secondly, the passages in Justin, Arnobius,¹ and Theo already mentioned above, cannot one and all be traced back to the single authority of Cephalion. Consequently, we must either think that the name is spelt incorrectly in Diodorus, and *Zoroasteres* must have been substituted for *Oxyartes*; or that Ctesias has really named *Oxyartes*, the King of Bactria, who was, according to him, a contemporary of Ninus and Semiramis, whilst the other sources from which Cephalion and others drew their informations called him Zoroaster. So the later authorities at least, if not Ctesias himself, placed the Magian Zoroaster in the age of Ninus and Semiramis. If the latter lived about 1273 B.C., as is now believed (see Gutschmid, p. 100; Brandis, “On the Historical Gain from the Decipherment

¹ He expressly introduces Ctesias as his authority for the Bactrian Zoroaster, quotes the book in which the passage was found, and speaks of the magical means wherewith the Assyrians and Bactrians had fought, which he could neither have drawn from Diodorus nor from Cephalion, just as he has stated to us.

of the Assyrian Inscriptions," p. 15), we have as the period of Zoroaster the middle of the thirteenth century before Christ, whereas those chroniclers who co-ordinate Ninus and Abraham mention Zoroaster in the seventh year of Abraham ; (compare Eusebius, *Chron.* II, p. 35 ed. Auch ; *Praep. Evang.* X, 9—a difference of 700 to 800 years).

A circumstance which might in particular render doubtful the account of the Greeks, which makes the Magian Zoroaster a contemporary of Semiramis, is the position of a *Bactrian King* which is attributed to him ; for nowhere in the original texts Zarathushtra has royal dignity (or kingship), though he is said to be the lord of all ranks and orders. On the contrary, *Vishtâspa* is expressly mentioned as the king in whose reign Zoroaster flourished, and who spread the holy Doctrine. This difficulty could only be solved by calling *Vishtâspa* a follower of the Prophet Zarathushtra, and by taking the former for the latter, so that we must regard Zoroaster-Vishtâspa himself as the Bactrian king abovenamed.

If the statement of Syncellus be true, we should have a Median Zoroaster, King of Babylonia, who is placed about 2458 B.C., and a Bactrian King Zoroaster, who is placed about 3000 B.C., or in 1273 according to the era of Ninus. But therewith all the difficulties do not come to an end. The authors of the "Pseudo-Clementinian Recognitions"—the Latin Translation of which is still preserved—and of the false "Clementinian Homilies" (which are, likewise, now extant in Greek, and which were written at least in the second century after Christ), who have, it is true, many intrinsic similarities, but who, too, differ from one another in manifold ways, as is proved by the passages cited below,¹ identify Zoroaster with *Mesraim*, son of *Cham* (*vide* "Recognitions"),

¹ *Recogn. Clement.* IV, 27 : "One of these (the sons of Noë) named Cham, delivered to one of his sons called Misraim "Egypt," from whom the Egyptian, Babylonian and Persian people took their origin, the ill-acquired art of magic. He was called Zoroaster by the heathens of those times, and admired as the first master of the magical art, under whose name exist very many books upon this art. A very great observer of the stars, he wished to be regarded as a divine being and began to elicit sparks from the stars and to show them to the people (comp. *Anonymus vor Malalas*, p. 17 ed. Bonn), wherewith dull and stupid people were amazed as with a wonder. Wishing to enhance his reputation he repeated this practice very often until he was burned by God himself whom he troubled too much." 28 "But the stupid men instead of rejecting as they ought to have done this belief about Zoroaster extolled him so much the more, notwithstanding they saw that he had been punished by death. For they built in his honour a monument and ventured to adore him as if he were a friend of God, and had been raised up to heaven in a chariot of lightning. They also venerated him as a living star. Hence he was called after his decease Zoroaster, i.e., "the living star," by those who had learned the Greek tongue after one generation (i.e., 30 years). For this reason many of those who are killed by lightning, are honoured with a monument, as if they were friends of God. After he had begun in the 14th generation, he died in the 15th, in which the (Babylonian) Tower was erected and the languages of men were divided (into many varieties)." (Here follows the passage about Nimrod). 29 "And he was burned by the wrath of the God to whom he had been too troublesome as is said above ; yet his ashes were collected, as if they were the remnants of the lightning, by those who were first deceived and brought to the Persians, to be preserved by them in constant watches, as godlike fire fallen from heaven, and to be adored as a heavenly God."

or with Nimrod (*vide* "Homilies of Clemens"). Later ecclesiastical writers are still more at variance in this question, calling now *Cham* (*Historia Scholastica* in Genesim, 39), now *Chus* (*Gregorius Turonius Historia*, I, 5), now *Assur* (Epiphanius, *Panar.*, p. 7 ; Procopius, *Gaz. in Gen.*, XI.) by the name of Zoroaster. The "Recognitions" say :—"This Zoroaster began his life in the fourteenth generation, and died in the fifteenth, at the time when the Tower (of Babel) was built, and there was a confusion of languages." But these fourteen generations are the ten from Adam to Noah inclusive, then Cham, Chus and Nimrod ; but which generation is further added, is not clear. All these identifications of Zoroaster are connected with Genesis X, 6, and tend to the belief that every magical art was the original property of the family of Cham. As Zoroaster was regarded as the representative of Magism, he was consequently set back, without hesitation, into this primeval time of Cham, although it was well-known, as is proved by the passages cited, that Zoroaster was of the Medo-Persian tribe. The origin of the Medians from Japheth, which is attested by the very passage in Genesis X, 2, is here overlooked. In order to maintain their hypothesis, these authors of the "Recognitions" traced the Persians back to Cham and Mezraim, whereby they forgot at the same time that the Chamitical Magism, which consisted of astrology and sorcery, very widely differed from the Zoroastrian Magism. It is possible that the reminiscences of a Median king Zoroaster in Babylon, or of the relations in which Ninus, who was thought identical with Nimrod, stood to Zoroaster, King of Bactria, had floated before the minds of these authors. It is certain that no historical trace could be found in all these combinations ; but they are only useful in showing the extent to which the conviction prevailed in antiquity that Zoroaster lived in far older times than the reigning family of the Achæmenidæ.

Clem. Homil. IX, 3 :—"One of these was Cham called Mizraim, from whom the Egyptian and Babylonian and Persian peoples take their origin." (4) "From this family came forth one who had inherited the magical art in succession. He was called Nebrod (Nimrod ?), and being a giant he chose to be an antagonist to God. Him the Greeks call Zoroaster". After the great Deluge he longed for empire, and being a great *Magus* (here "sorcerer") he forced by magical arts the horoscopic star (here the readings vary much) . . . to give him empire. But when he was as it were ruling, and had authority from the star which he had forced, he poured out the fire of the empire in pride, that he might act according to his oath and revenge himself upon him who had first compelled him." (5) "By this lightning which had fallen from heaven on the earth Ninrod was destroyed, and from this accident he was surnamed *Zoroaster* on account of the living stream of the star. Yet the ignorant people of those times, thinking that his soul was taken up by the thunderstroke owing to his love of God, interred the remains of the body, but honoured the tomb by a temple built in Persia where the bringing down of fire had taken place. He was honoured like a god, and after his example others, too, who died there by the thunderstroke, were interred like the friends of God and honoured with temples, and statues were erected in the individual forms of the dead persons" (6) "The Persians first took coals from the thunderbolt which had fallen from heaven, watched and nourished them at home and venerated the fire like a god, being the first to adore it : and by means of this fire they first had the honour of domination. After them the Babylonians stole coals of this fire, and preserved them in their houses and adored it, and they got the empire subsequently."

There is a remarkable difference between the statements of the "Recognitions" and those of the "Clementinian Homilies" as regards Zoroaster. The former represent him as drawing rays of light (or flash of lightning) from the stars,¹ and state that in consequence of his repeating this act too frequently, as he was urged to do so by the *daeua* by whose strength he performed it, he was killed through fire (i.e., lightning). The "Clementinian Homilies," on the contrary, represent him as requesting the gift of domination from the star of that *daeua* who rules over this world with magical arts, after which the *daeua* pours down the fire of dominion by which he (*viz.*, Nimrod-Zoroaster) is immediately devoured. This death by lightning has led to the apotheosis or glorification of Zoroaster, over whose body a temple (?) was erected in Persia. The Persians, it is said, had nourished the cinders of this lightning, and adored the fire as a deity. By this means they first obtained domination,² and after them the Babylonians who had also stolen cinders of fire and then become rulers. The latter circumstance is somewhat shortened by the "Recognitions." But both documents have essentially in common a whimsical explanation of the name Zoroaster, though there is here also some small deviation. The "Recognitions" render Zoroaster by the Lat. *vivum sidus* (Gr. *Zoronas-tron*) "living star." The "Clementinian Homilies" explain it by *zosa roe toū asteros* "a living stream of the star." I need not remark how very absurd these derivations are. But the fire, and indeed the fire coming from Heaven, is a symbol of dominion, which is a genuine feature of the statement. For the *hvarena* of kings is a brilliancy of light which originates from God *Ahura*.

Dio Chrysostom of Prusa in Bithynia, a friend of Plutarch, who was exiled under the Emperor Domitian, but had great authority in Rome under Nerva and Trajan, has preserved in his "Borysthenian Oration" (Tome II, p. 60 *seq.*, edition of Dindorf) an alleged myth of the Magi, which is worthy of closer investigation. I quote here this passage dropping what is not essential, or what is purely rhetorical ornamentation. After speaking of the Divine Empire over the Universe, Dio Chrysostom goes on to state:—"Another marvellous myth is sung in the mysterious consecrations of the Magi who praise this God as the first and perfect Conductor of the most perfect Wagon. For the car of Helios," he says, "is younger than this and visible to the whole world, its course being apparent. The strong and perfect team of Zeus has

¹ This reminds us of the *pairikas*, which, according to the *Tir. Yt.* § 8, fall down as shooting stars between heaven and earth.

² The later fabulists describe the death of Zoroaster in a similar manner. So *Cronicon Pasch.*, Vol. I, p. 67, ed. Bonn:—"From his family (of Ninus) issued the very illustrious (Chaldean) Zoroaster who on the point of death requested to be devoured by heavenly fire, saying to the Persians: 'if the fire destroys me, take up and preserve some burning bones, and the domination shall not disappear from your country as long as you keep my bones.' And he prayed to Orion, and he was destroyed by heavenly fire. And the Persians did as he had bidden them, and they still keep the ashes of him which remain until our days." Comp. *Cedrenus*, v. 1, p. 29, ed. Bonn; *Anonymus vor Malulus* (I, p. 18, ed. Bonn) and *Suidas*, s. v. *Zoroastres*.

never been praised so worthily by the Greeks, neither by Homer nor by Hesiod ; but Zoroaster and the sons of the Magi that were his disciples, celebrated it (worthily). Zoroaster is said by the Persians to have left society owing to his love of justice and wisdom, and to have lived a solitary life on a mountain. Then this mountain had begun to burn on account of the huge quantity of fire falling from Heaven, and had continued so to burn ; wherefore the King with the chiefs of the Persians had approached thither, intending to adore the Deity. Then it was that Zoroaster had come forth unhurt from the fire and approached them gracefully, bidding them not to be afraid (of the awful prospect) ; but to offer some offerings unto God, since He had visited their territory. Then Zoroaster had intercourse not with all of them, but with those only who were most qualified for truth and most apt for an intercourse with God, and whom the Persians called Magi, *i.e.*, such as understood how to serve the Divine Being,¹ but not sorcerers, as the Greeks called them from their ignorance of the name. Beside other functions fixed by the holy ordinances, the Magi are to nourish for Zeus a team of Nisæian horses (these are the finest and largest in Asia), and for Helios only one horse. But they developed the myth with great boldness saying :—“It is only a conducting and car-driving of the Universe, which is executed with the greatest expertness and strength, always and unceasingly in the unceasing period of time. The courses of the Sun and Moon are only partial movements, and so more apparent, whilst the motion of the Universe is unknown to the common people.” Dio hesitatingly dares to sing the pagan song of the horses of this team along with the pleasant Hellenic songs. It appears to him so extravagant. The first horse is of extraordinary beauty, greatness and swiftness, winged and sacred to Zeus. He has the colour of purest light, Sun and Moon are his marks, the other stars including. The second horse, who is next to him and yoked with him, is called after *Here*. He is tame and soft and much inferior in strength and swiftness to the first, black by nature, only that part is shining which is illumined by *Helios*. The third is sacred to *Poseidon*, and slower than the second. Poets call him *Pegasus*. But the fourth and most improbable of all is stiff and immoveable, unwinged and belonging to *Hestia*. Nevertheless, they (the Magi) do not dismiss the image, but they say that this horse, too, is yoked to the wain. He remains in his place champing a bit of diamond. He clings to his place with all his parts, and the two others near him bow towards him ; whilst the first and most distant horse always moves round the remaining as round the goal of an arena. Commonly they are peaceable ; but now and then a strong pull of the first causes a conflagration of the world, like that of the Hellenic *Phaethon*, or some vast sweat of the third causes a flood like that of *Deucalion*. All this, however, is no fortuitous accident, as people fancy, but it is executed after the design of the Wise Driver of the Wagon. Beside this movement of the Universe there is also a movement and transformation of

¹ The same definition is given by Dio elsewhere.

these four that changed their form, until they all adopted one nature, vanquished by the stronger. This motion also is compared by them in a still bolder image with wagon-driving, as if a wonder-working man forms horses of wax, taking away and turning off from each one and adding to the other, until he combines all four into one, and works up one form of the whole mass. But it is not as though the demiurgi were working from outside on lifeless images, and changing the materials ; but they, as it were, themselves endured the same as in a struggle for victory in a great and true combat. This victory was naturally gained by the first, strongest, and swiftest horse was at the beginning designated as the chosen one of Zeus. For this horse being the strongest of all, and naturally all fiery, devours the others in a very short time, as if they were indeed made of wax ; but they seem infinite according to our calculation. The first horse takes into himself the whole essence of others. He appears much larger and brighter than before, having turned out the vanquisher in the greatest combat, not through any one of mortals or immortals, but through himself. Again he stands proud and haughty, glad at his victory and needing larger space on account of his strength and valour. Having arrived at this point of the narration the author is afraid of naming the real nature of the animal, which is simply the spirit of the Wain-driver and Lord, or rather His understanding and guiding essence."

So far, it seems, runs the description of the Magi in Dio Chrysostom. It is difficult to decide how much of this mythical discourse is drawn from a true Magian document, and how much has been added by the Greek panegyrist, as such additions are to be presumed on account of the occurrence of the names of Zeus, Here, Poseidon, Hestia and Pegasus, and from the references to Phæthon and Deucalion. Or it may be that the whole matter has been invented by Dio, and ascribed to the Magi. The latter, however, does not seem probable. On the contrary, it is possible that Dio, who speaks of the mysterious initiations of the Magi, has drawn this matter from the " Mithraic mysteries " which prevailed at Rome in those times. The idea of a wagon with four horses being driven by God is not opposed to the Magian mode of belief. We find in the original Avesta texts that *Andhita* drives in a chariot with four white horses (*Abân Yt.*, §§ 11, 13), which are afterwards designated as Wind, Rain, Cloud, and Lightning (*ibid* § 120). *Mithra*, too, has a team of four white horses, whose forehoofs are shod with gold, the hinder ones with silver. (*Mih* *Yt.*, § 125). The same thing is mentioned of *Sraosha* (*Yasna* LVII, §27), though he is drawn by falcons of all surpassing swiftness. It is not, therefore, impossible that such a team of four horses was ascribed to Ahura Mazda, too, in some Avesta text which is now lost.

The horses of the team are easily to be interpreted as light, air, water, and earth. The combination of light and air reminds us of the combination (so frequently found in the Avesta texts) of *Mithra*, the representative of light, and *Râma Qâstra* (*vayush uparo kairyô*), the genius of air, who likewise appears personified in the *Râm Yt.*, § 54, *seq.* As they were so well represented

under the image of mighty warriors, they might as well also be represented under the image of horses; for we see *Tishtrya* and *Verethraghna* take the shape of horses in the *Yashts* dedicated to them (*Tir Yt.*, § 18; *Bahrām Yt.*, § 9).

Moreover, we have the description of the wain of Zeus, who is evidently identical with Ahura Mazda, in Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, VIII, 3, 12, where a white wagon—the colour refers to the horses of the wagon—with golden yoke and sacred to Zeus, is conducted in a procession.

What is said by Dio Chrysostom of the bright horse reputed to be the soul of the chariot-driving God, this, too, is Magian in my opinion. It is the *Fravashi* of Ahura Mazda, that is spoken of in the *Fravardin Yt.*, §§ 80, 81, as we have seen above.

Most important is what Dio says about Zarathushtra. He had lived from love of justice and wisdom in solitude on a mountain burning with fire which fell from Heaven. Out of this burning mountain the prophet had made his appearance to the King¹ and commenced his Revelations. Whence has Dio drawn this? The life of Zoroaster in the solitude and on a mountain is, I think, founded, as has been already presumed by me in my discourse on *Mithra*, p. 63, on a statement of *Vend. Farg.* XIX, 4, compared with the *Bundahish*, p. 53, l. 5, p. 58, l. 5, and p. 79, l. 10. Porphyrius in *De antronymph*, c. 6., describes after Eubulus the Mithraic cavern which Zoroaster had consecrated on the mountain in the neighbourhood of Persia.

The burning mountain from which Zoroaster came forth, reminds us of the burning *thorn-bush* of Moses; I cannot recall any similar thing in the Avesta texts, though a passage in the *Bundahish* might be pointed at with regard to this allusion.

¹ By the bye, I remark that Dio, or his authority, does not mean to identify this king with the father of Darius.

EASTERN IRANIAN CIVILIZATION IN ANCIENT TIMES.*

DR. GEIGER'S INTRODUCTION.

IN my history of the "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians in Ancient Times," I have characterized the Avestic religion in a few pages, since it would have been impossible for me to devote to that subject an equally detailed description of other features in their civilized life, without enlarging too much the extent of my book. But it may not appear superfluous to preface the English translation of some interesting chapters on Ethnography and Private Life (*Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 167-422) with an exposition of the Avesta religion—a subject of special importance to my readers amongst the Parsees—adhering to the principles which have guided me in the elaboration of the entire work I shall endeavour also to describe the religion as plainly and vividly as possible not merely according to its contents (*doctrines*), but also according to its spirit its tendency, and its history. I shall further confine myself as closely as possible to the statements of the Avesta, abstaining from all allusion to later authorities as far as practicable.

GENERAL REMARKS.

With the single exception of the Israelites, no nation of antiquity in the East has been able to attain to such purity and sublimity of religious thought as the Avestic nation. Nowhere do we meet with conceptions which approximate so closely to a pure monotheism, nowhere is the notion of the Deity so free from human adjuncts, nowhere is the purely spiritual part of religion worked out with such exactness and preciseness. If this in itself is sufficient to awaken universal interest, it must undoubtedly do so far more powerfully when we learn that this religion is not the result of a long unconscious development, but, on the contrary, rather the outcome of conscious speculation. The Avesta religion was founded in Eastern Irān, and its institution is connected with the name of Zarathushtra. Zarathushtra himself must have brought it already to perfection, as the legends of the Parsees indicate, on the soil of Media, whence he must have diffused it through the eastern provinces. Every founder of religion works with the aid of materials acquired from history. The Christian doctrine rests upon the basis of the old Judaic religion, Mahomet attempts to unite both Christianity and Judaism, while Zarathushtra grounds his work upon the old Arian religion of nature, which the Irānian nation shared with the Indian people.

Upon this fact of a common foundation are based all analogies between the Zoroastrian and the Brahmanical religions. It is not my task to enter here upon a discussion of their resemblances; I only remark that, according to my conviction, their similarity has been frequently exaggerated.

* Translated by Dastur D. D. P. Sanjanā from the original German of Dr. Wilhelm Geiger, now Professor of Oriental languages at the University of Berlin.

It is certain that Zarathushtra, conscious of its tendency, radically altered the existing materials. The form and tenor of the old religion were altered alike, to such an extent indeed, that scarcely anything has survived from the ancient faith except some names and certain primitive ideas. The last remnants of the symbolical conceptions of nature have been, scantily enough, preserved in certain *yazatas*¹, like *Mithra*, *Srausha*, *Anāhita*. But the characteristic and essential portion of the religion, that part in fact which gives it its true nature, is entirely a new creation.

In the place of the vague and irregular nature-worship, there appears a solid, compact, consistent system. The tenor of the new doctrine was essentially moral. The ethical conception of the Deity appears in the foreground, while the natural is withdrawn from view. In the earlier religion one Deity stood on the same level as another. Each was in his sphere the most influential; even more, according to the requirements of the moment each could be esteemed as the highest and the most powerful of all. This idea found no place in the new doctrine. The multitude of forces and powers was concentrated in a single Deity, who stands far above all other supernatural beings—into

I. AHURA MAZDA.

AHURA MAZDA is the Ruler and King of the invisible, as well as of the visible world. It is He Himself Who has revealed His holy religion to Zarathushtra. In His being Ahura Mazda is a spirit. His most conspicuous attributes are *Asha*, 'Holiness,' and *Chisti*, 'Wisdom.' Even His name describes Him as the 'Wise' (*Mazda*), and as the 'Lord' (*Ahura*)². Extremely characteristic is the very address which constantly recurs in the Vendidad :

Ahura · Mazda · mainyô · spēnishta · dātare · gaēthanām · astuvaitinām · ashū-um !

'Ahura Mazda the Most Blissful Spirit, Creator of the Corporeal World, Thou Holy !'

Or more briefly only :

Dātare · gaēthanām · astuvaitinām · ashāum !

'Creator of the Corporeal World, Thou Holy !'

With this we may also further compare the first words of the Yasna :

Nivaēdhayemi · hankārayemi · dathushô · Ahurahe · Mazdāo · raēvatô · qarenağhatô · mazishtahecha · vahishtahecha · sraēštahecha ·

¹ [Angels or spiritual Genii presiding over elements or elementary excellences as well as over physical, abstract, and ethical ideas. In the abstract, anything that is excellent and worthy of praise in the moral and material nature of the Universe and that glorifies the wisdom of the Deity is a *yazata*. *Translator's note*.]

² *Ahura* (Skt. *asura* from rt. *ah*, 'to be.' *Mazdāo* is very differently explained; but the idea of wisdom indisputably underlies the name,

khraozhdishtahecha · khrahrvishtahecha · hukereptemahecha · ashāt · apanōtemahecha · hudhāomanō · vouru-rafnağhō · yō · nō · dadha·yō· tatasha·yō· tuthruye · yō · mainyush · spentōtemō · (Yasna I, 1.)

'I declare it, and I venerate the Creator, Ahura Mazda, the Brilliant Radiant, the Greatest, Best, Most Beautiful, Mightiest, Wisest, Best-formed, Most Exalted through Holiness, Giving Profusely, Granting Much Bliss, Who created us, Who prepares us, Who maintains us the Most Blissful Spirit.'

In the above are given the principal attributes that constitute the nature of Ahura Mazda.

He is a Spirit. He is not anthropomorphous. Though He is represented as speaking, thinking, and acting, no passage of the Avesta authorizes us to assume that Ahura Mazda was thought to exist in any definite visible form. Surely His form could not be compared with that of the human body. The expression 'Best-formed,' *hukereptemahe*, must not be pressed too far, and if, on the other hand, mention is made of 'the most beautiful body of Mazda,' *Sraeshtām · at · lōi · kehrpem · kehrpām · avaēdhayemahi. Mazdā. Ahurā*¹ we must regard such language as symbolical. For the sun (*hvarē*) is expressly spoken of as 'the body of Mazda'², and no one could well affirm that this designation should be understood literally. Light is indeed of the essence of Ahura; and hence the sun as the source of perceptible light renders Mazda, so to say, visible Himself.

So early as in the Gāthās Ahura Mazda is very frequently apostrophized as the Blissful Spirit³. Anthropomorphisms are exceedingly rare, rarer still perhaps than with the Jehovah of the ancient Jews. When Spentā Armātī the protectress of the earth and the genius of *submissive devotion*, is called the daughter of Mazda, it can scarcely be looked upon as a proof of anthropomorphism. It is merely a symbolical expression, which is intended to mean that all good on earth, as also piety of heart, originates from Ahura.

Let us only consider the passage itself :

At · fravakhshyā · ağheush · ahyā · valishtem.

Ashāt · hachā · Mazdāo · vaēdā · yē · im · dāt.

Plarēm · vağhēush · verezyantō · manağhō.

At · hōi · dugedā · hushkyaothanā · ārmaitish ⁴.

'Announce will I the best in this world,

Through Piety I know (Thee), O Mazda, Who created it,

Thee, the Father of the pious and zealously active Mind ;

But His daughter is the *Well-behaving Humility*.'

¹ Yasna LVIII, 8 ; XXXVI, 6.

² Yasht VI, 6.

³ Yasht XVII, 2 ; Vendidad XIX, 6.

⁴ Yasna XLV, 4.

The same can be said of the following passage :

*Pita · te · yô · Ahurô · Mazdâo · yô · mazishtë · yazutanām · yô · vahishtë · yazatanām · mātā · ārmaitish · spentā · brāta · te · yô · vaḡhush · sraoshô · ashyô · rashnushcha · berezô*¹.

‘Thy Father, O Ashi ! is Ahura Mazda, the Greatest and Best amongst the Yazatas ; thy mother is Spentā Ārmatī, thy brother the good Srausha the Holy and Rashnu the Exalted.’

Mention is also made of spouses of Ahura Mazda. Here the names of the spouses show that we have again to deal with a metaphorical mode of expression. The figure is meant to symbolize their close union, their inseparable connection. Hence Ashi and Ārmatī may be very appropriately designated in a poetical manner as the spouses of Mazda, while they are elsewhere called his daughters, by a somewhat different figure of speech. Besides the above, we meet with other abstract ideas, such as Blessing, Plenty, and Salvation (*ishem, āzūtīm, frasastīm*)², which are also the names of the wives of Ahura.

With particular emphasis fire, the importance of which in the *cultus* of the Mazdayasnān need not be pointed out, is invoked as the son of Ahura Mazda (*ātaremcha · Ahurahe · Mazdâo · puthrem*)³. It is the holiest and purest element, that which diffuses light. As such it appears to be the earthly and visible image of the Deity, Who is Himself light and absolute purity. A conception just as deep underlies the idea that the sun is the eye of Mazda.⁴ This must not be understood too materially, for that would clash essentially with the spirit of the Avesta religion in general. Mazda has his throne above in Heaven, whence He looks with His radiant eye, the bright sun, down upon the earth. His look scares away the darkness, and the demons who lodge in darkness ; He also penetrates into the souls of men, and perceives what is good and what is evil in them. Similarly, in the German proverb, ‘The sun brings it to light,’ the sun symbolizes the Divine Omniscience, which discovers every crime.

Ahura Mazda is a spirit. He is a superhuman and transcendent being. His attributes are therefore chiefly spiritual ones. He is the Wise, the Omniscient, the Holy or Pure, the Benign.

In the first Yasht, which is dedicated to Ahura Mazda, which describes His nature, His innumerable epithets are cited. Here He is called Wisdom (*Chistish*) simply, or the Wise one (*Chistivāo*)⁵. He is named the Observer (*Spashta*)⁶ Who sees all, the Infallible one (*Adhavi*)⁷ Whom nobody can deceive and impose upon. So, too, as early as in the Gāthās :

*Nōit · diwzhaidyāi · vīspā-hishas · Ahurô*⁸.

‘Ahura is not to be deceived, Who has created all.’

¹ Yasht XVII, 16.

² Ys. XXXVIII, 2.

³ Ys. II, 4.

⁴ Ys. I, 11 [*Hvarecha.khahagtah.aurvataspah.đōithrah. Ahurah.Mazdāo*].

⁵ Also *Khratush* and *Khratumāo* Yt. I, 7, 8 ; also *Zhnāta*, Yt. I, 12.

⁶ Yt. I, 13 ; *Viepa-hishas*, Yt. I, 8.

⁷ *Adhavi*, from the root *dab, dav*, Yt. I, 14.

⁸ Ys. XLV, 4.

Yā · frasd · avishyā · yā · vā · Mazdā · peresaile · layi ·
 Yē · vā · kasēush · aēnāghō · ā · mazishlām · ayamaile · būjem.
 Tā · chashmēng · thwistrā · hārō · aibī · ashū · aibī · vaēnahī · vīspā ¹ ·
 'The public counsels which take place,
 O Mazda Ahura, and the secret ones,
 Who imposest the highest penalty for a small one ;
 Upon all this Thou lookest as a warder with eyes radiant with holiness.

Ahura Mazda is also identified with the Best Holiness, with *Asha-vahishta* ² 'Holy' and 'Pure' are His constant epithets. All is good in Him, as also only goodness issues from Him. And as the believers in Mazda shall imitate Him, so also they, as the 'pure' or 'holy,' are styled the *Ashavanō*.

But Mazda is also the *Benign*. He is called the Good-giver (*Hudhūnush* or *Hudhāoman* ³). He is not wholly inaccessible to men ; the prayers of the pious ascend to Him, and are heard by Him. And there are as many visible earthly gifts for which He is implored, as there are spiritual ones, such as piety and good-mindedness.

Mazdāo · dadāt · Ahurō · haurvatō · amertūtaschā.
 Bārōish · ā · ashaqyāchā · qā-paitiyyāt · khshathruhyā · sarō ·
 Vāghēush · vazdvarē · manuḡho · yē · hōi · mainyū · shkyaothanāishchā ·
 urvathō ⁴.

'May Ahura Mazda grant well-being and long-life,
 Protection of profuse piety and of mastery over one's self,
 Power of the good-mind to him, who is devoted to Him in thought and deed.'

Hvō · zī · ashā · speqtō · erektem · vīspōibyō ·
 Hārō · mainyū · ahūbish · urvathō · Mazdā ⁵.

'Thou art in holiness the Blissful, Who turns away mischief,
 Of all beings, Thou, O Spirit, Mazda !'

Though Mazda is thus a spirit, still he stands in close correlation to the world. He is its Creator, its Preserver, and Ruler (*Dātur*, *Pātar*, *Ise-khshathru*).

I have under the section 'The World' given the translation of a sublime Hymn, which praises the omnipotence and wisdom of the Creator ⁶. I scarcely know of a passage of the Avesta which can equal it in poetical beauty, though the idea that the entire world, and what is in it, originates from Mazda, and that He has bestowed upon man spiritual graces, is also frequently expressed in other passages. Hence the numerous appellatives, such as Bliss (*Spānō*) simply, or the Blissful (*Spanāghvat*, *Sevishta*), the Creator (*Dātare*), the Supporter or Preserver (*Thrātār*, *Pāyu* ⁷). Thus Ahura existed even from the beginning, before the world came into existence, which He had called into being

¹ Ys. XXXI, 13.

² Yt. I, 7, 12.

³ Yt. I, 15 ; Ys. I, 1.

⁴ Ys. XXXI, 21 ; comp. also Ys. XXXIII, 10.

⁵ Ys. XLIV, 2.

⁶ Ys. XLIV, 3-5.

⁷ Yt. I, 7, 8, 11.

by an act of His will, and thus He exists immutable and unchangeable for all eternity.

*Yastū · mantū · pouruyō · ruochēbish · rōithven · qāthrā ·
Hvō · khrathwā · dāmish · ashem · yū · dārayat · vahishtem · manō.
Tā · Mazdā · mainyā · ukhshyō · yē · ā · nūremchāt · Ahurā · hāmō.
At · thwā · mēghī · paourvīm · Mazdā · yazūm · stōi · manaǵhā.
Vaǵhēush · patarem · manaǵhō · hyat · thwā · hēm · chashmainī · heṇ
grabem.*

Huithīm · ashahyā · dāmīm · aǵhēush · Ahurem · shkyaothanaeshū¹.

He who first conceived the thought : With stars may the effulgent space be clothed !

He through His insight created the Law (the system of the world) where-
by He supports the pious ;

Thou allowest it to thrive, O Spirit Mazda, Who art the same even now.
Thee chiefly I regard as Him Who must be praised in the mind by men.
Thee as the Father of the pious, for I perceived Thee with mine eyes
As the (true) Founder of the world's system, as the Lord (Commander)
of the world through Thy energy.'

But not merely are the world and its order His work, it is also said of Him :

Yē · dāt · manō · ruhīō · Mazdā · ashyaščā.

Hvo-daēnām · shkyaothanāchā · vachaǵhāchā.²

'Who created the good and holy mind,

And the doctrine, together with the prayers and the works of offering.'

Fire is again most particularly mentioned as the creation and gift of grace of Mazda :

At · thwā · mēnǵhāi · lukhmemchā · spentem · Mazdā.

Hyat · tū · zastā · yā · tū · hafshī · avāo.

Yāo · dāo · ashīsh · dregrāitē · ashāunaeshā.

Thwadyā · garemā · āthró · ashā-aojāǵhō³.

'I will consider Thee, O Mazda, as the strong and the Blissful,

In order that by Thy hand, with which Thou createst help,

The benedictions (might be granted to me) which Thou gavest to the
pious as also to the impious

Through the warmth of Thy Fire, the All-Powerful.'

And how Mazda rules over all from the beginning of the world to its end, is expressly described in the following stanza :

Spentem · at · thwā · Mazdā · mēghī · Ahurā ·

Yyat · thwā · aǵhēush · zāthōi · daresem · paourvīm.

Hyat · dāo · shkyaothanā · mīzdavān · yāchā · ukhdhā .

Akēm · akāi · vaǵuhīm · ashīm · vaǵhareṇ.

¹ Ys. XXXI, 7-8.

² Ys. XLVIII, 4.

³ Ys. XLIII, 4.

Thwā · hunarā · dāmōish · urvassē . apēmē ¹.

'I thought of Thee as the Blissful, O Mazda,

For I saw Thee as the First at the origin of the world,

For Thou didst create the works of offering, promising reward for them
and prayers,

And evil for the vicious, but good blessing for the good,

Through Thy Glory at the dissolution of the world.'

This leads us finally to one power of Ahura Mazda² not discussed above, which He exercises in conformity with His Holiness and Justice, and by means of His Omniscience and Infallibility: He is the God, Who rewards the good and punishes the bad, not only in this world in which He sends blessing or misfortune to men, but also at the end of this world, in the next one.

The idea of eternal retribution is so often expressed in the Avesta, that it is not necessary to notice it here more particularly. In the section treating of 'Immortality' and the next world, several such passages relating thereto will be found translated.

We thus know that Ahura Mazda is a spiritual being. He is *Wise, Holy, Just, and Benign*. He has created the whole world, so far as it is itself good and faultless, but He also supports and governs it. Before the beginning of the world He existed, and will outlast it. He is the Champion of the Powers of Light against Evil, and will bring victory at the end of the conflict.

In this sublime conception of the Avesta, Ahura Mazda undoubtedly stands far above the deities of the Vedic Pantheon. As already mentioned, only the Jehovah of the ancient Jews may be compared to Him. But however obvious the similarity between the God of Israel and the God of the Mazdayasna may be, still I reject entirely the assumption that the Avesta people have borrowed from the Jews. Upon the Irānian soil a narrowly-confined nation has, independently and of itself, attained that high conception of God, which, with the exception of the Jews, was never attained by any Arian, Semitic, or Tūrānian tribe ².

¹ Yas. XLIII, 5.

² ['Spitamā Zarathushtra's conception of Ahuramazda as the Supreme Being is perfectly identical with the notion of *Elohim* (God) or *Jehovah* which we find in the books of the Old Testament. Ahuramazda is called by him "the Creator of the earthly and spiritual life, the Lord of the whole universe, in whose hands are all the creatures." He is the light and source of light; he is the wisdom and intellect. He is in possession of all good things, spiritual and worldly, such as the good mind, immortality, health, the best truth, devotion and piety, and abundance of every earthly good. All these gifts he grants to the righteous man, who is upright in thoughts, words, and deeds. As the ruler of the whole universe, he not only rewards the good, but he is a punisher of the wicked at the same time (see Yas. XLIII, 5). All that is created, good or evil, fortune or misfortune, is his work (Yas. XLVIII, 4, and LI, 6).'] Vide M. Haug, *Essays*, p. 302 —*Tr. note.*]

Ahura Mazda does not stand alone. He is also the highest amongst all the spirits ; thus He is surrounded by a body of genii or angels, who assist Him in His work, or to whom certain spheres of activity are assigned.

The mightiest and most venerable amongst them are

II. THE AMESHA SPENTA.

There are six Amesha Spentas. Their name signifies 'the blissful immortal.' The most significant appellatives which they receive are *yavaē-jt*, 'living in eternity,' and *yavaē-su*, 'blessing in eternity.' Besides they are also called *khshathra*, *hudāo*, 'well-ruling, granting good,' or *hware-hazaosha*, 'of one will with the sun'. The last name may indicate that it is their task to create light like the sun. Light however is the symbol of moral purity.

The functions of the Amesha Spenta are also peculiar to the Zoroastrian system of religion. They have been compared with the Vedic Adityas, but without any valid reason. I do not see any cause why a founder of religion like Zarathushtra should not independently have arrived at the idea of joining with the Almighty a circle of angels or ministering spirits.

The names of the Amesha Spenta are perfectly clear. They are abstract and indeed mostly ethical conceptions. They are called :

1. *Vohu-manō*, the good mind.
2. *Asha-vahishta*, the best holiness.
3. *Khshathra-vairya*, the desirable sovereignty.
4. *Spentā-Ārmatī*, humble sense.
5. *Harvatāt*, well-being, happiness, health.
6. *Amertūt*, long-life, immortality.

The abstract meaning is everywhere so clearly perceptible, that by that alone the distinct position of the Amesha Spenta is established, if contrasted with the genii of other religious systems. The double meaning is so marked, that we might really translate in a double way many verses of the Gāthās, in which the names of the Amesha Spenta occur, at one time in the abstract, and at another in the personal signification of their names.

In the Gāthās themselves, Ahura Mazda is frequently invoked together with the Amesha Spenta, particularly with Vohu-manō, Asha, Khshathra, and Ārmatī.

Yē · vāo · Ashā · usyānī · manaschā · vohū · apaourvīm.

Mazdāmchā · Ahurem · yaēibyō · khshathremchā · agzhaonvamnem.

Varedaitī · Ārmatish · ā · mōi · rafedhrāi · zaveñg · jasatā¹.

'You both will I praise, Asha and Vohu-manō the incomparable.

And Mazda Ahura, and together with them the imperishable
Khshathra,

And the blessing-dispensing Ārmatī : come hither at my invocation !'

¹ Ys. XXXIX, 3 : II, 2 ; Yt. X, 51 ; XIII, 92.

² Ys. XXVIII, 4.

Dāidē . ashā . tām . ashīm . vaǵhēush . āyaptū . manaǵhō .

Dāidi . tū . ārmatī . vištāspāi . aēshem . maibyāchā .

Dāostū . Mazdā . khshayāchā . yā . vē . māthrā . srevīmā . rādāo . ¹

'Grant, O Asha ! this blessing, together with the gift of grace of Vohu-manō ;

Grant Thou, O Ārmati ! to Vištāspa his wish and to me ;

Grant Thou, O Mazda ! Thou Powerful, that we may proclaim your words as channels of grace !'

Ahmāichā . Khshathrā . jasat . manaǵhā . vohū . ashāchā .

At . kehrepem . utayūtish . dadāt . ārmatish . ānmā ².

'But towards us He (Mazda) turned, together with Khshathra, Vohu-manō, and Asha ;

Strength created the body, but Ārmati gave prosperity.'

From these examples we observe that Mazda and the first four Amesha Spenta are indeed the most ancient constituent parts of the Zoroastrian system, that these genii form, so to say, the basis upon which the whole structure rests. Or can it be a mere accident that just the most sensuous and the most humanly-conceived *yazatas*, Mithra and Anāhita, are Scarcely mentioned in the Gāthās !

Let us now examine each individual Amesha Spenta.

Each of them has a definite field of activity in the visible world also, while Ahura holds the supreme direction of all that exists. To Vohu-manō is entrusted the protection of herds ; to Asha, that of fire ; to Khshathra, that of metals ; to Ārmati, the guardianship of the earth ; lastly to the genii, Harvatāt and Amertāt, the protection of waters and of plants. The intrinsic relation between the abstract signification of each individual name and the material functions, which the respective genius always discharges, may, I think, be further proved. Such proof I shall now endeavour to furnish.

That VOHU-MANŌ, *the good-mind*, is also the protector of herds, is explained from the social circumstances under which the Zoroastrian religion developed itself in the very oldest periods. At that time a great portion of the people still led a nomadic life. Others had established permanent settlements ; they cultivated the fields, and attended to the rearing of cattle. Amongst the latter the new doctrine found access ; *they* were the ' pious ' and ' good-minded ones.' The life of a good mind was at the same time the life of peaceful herdsmen and peasants. We have passages in the Gāthās where we may translate Vohu-manō directly by ' herds : '

At . hī . ayāo . fravaretā . vāstrīm . aqyāi . fshuyantem .

Ahurem . ashavanem . vaǵhēush . fshēnghē . manaǵhō .

Nōt . Mazdā . avāstryō . davāschinā . humaretōish . bakhshātū ³.

'But she, the Cow, selected of those two the laborious countryman,

¹ Ys. XXVIII, 8,

² Ys. XXX, 7.

³ Ys. XXXI, 10.

To be her pious lord, the protector of herds (or, of *the good-mind*) ;

But he who did not follow agriculture, O Mazda ! did not participate in the good religion, though he attempted to deceive.'

The ambiguity of the Gāthā texts is thus actually increased since we have now, for one single idea, the choice between a personal, an abstract and a material translation.

That Vohu-manō was, however, not merely regarded as the guardian of herds, but of living beings in general, especially of men, may be perceived from the nineteenth Fargard of the Vendidad, where the word *vohu-manō* is to be rendered directly by 'man'.

Vohu-manō is the first amongst the Amesha Spenta. These are therefore spoken of as 'those who dwell together with Vohu-manō' (*Yōi · vaǵhēush · manaǵhō · shkʷeinti*¹). He plainly appears as their chief and spokesman, when he is in Paradise. As soon as a soul approaches, he rises from his 'golden throne,' addresses it, and shows it the place allotted to it².

ASHA-VAHISHTĀ, *the best piety or purity*, is at the same time the genius of fire. The reason of this lies in the fact that fire is the symbol of purity. Nowhere does the double nature of Asha more clearly appear than in the passage where Angra Manyu plaintively exclaims :

*Tāpayeiti . mām . asha . vahishta . mānayan . ahē . yatha . ayaokhshustem . rakō . mē . hacha . aǵhāo · zemat . vaǵhō · kerenaoiti . yō · mām · aevō · jāmayeiti · yō · Spitāmō · Zarathushtrō*³.

'He burns me with the *Asha-vahishta* (the Holy Fire), like red-hot metal ; he best drives me from the earth, he, who alone makes me fly, is the son of Spitama, Zarathushtra.'

KHSHATHRA-VARYA, *the desirable sovereignty*, is a being not very clearly defined. To him is entrusted the care of metals. We trace the same idea in the Avesta itself, when *khshathra-vairya* is plainly used for 'metal'⁴ or for 'a metallic instrument, knife'⁵, just as we have seen *vohu-manō* also denoting 'herds,' and *asha-vahishta* 'fire.' In what connection the ideal and material functions of Khshathra stand to each other, I cannot explain.

SPENTĀ ĀRMATĪ is of far more interest to us. This angel plays also in the Avesta a part dissimilar to and far more independent than those mentioned above. The name literally denotes '*moderate thinking*,'—the mind which always keeps itself within the bounds of what is right and good. By this is not only to be understood wisdom, but even more, *humility and quiet resignation to the will of God*.⁶

¹ Ys. XXXIX, 3.

² Vendidad XIX, 32.

³ Yt. XVII, 20.

⁴ Vend. XVI, 6, *ayagha:nem . vā.srum . vā.nitema . khshathravairya*.

⁵ Yt. X, 125 ; Vd. IX, 9.

⁶ This appears clearly from the mere name of the demon *Tarōmaiti* (formally and materially an opponent of *Armaiti*), evidently 'arrogance.' And the verbs '*tarem-man*' and '*arem-man*,' in Ys. XLV, 11, have opposite meanings. I believe that *Ārmaiti*, as it follows hence, is contracted from '*arem-maiti*.'

Materially, Spentā Ārmati is the protectress of the earth. This part of her nature appears most clearly in the legend of Yima, according to which, when under that king, men, beasts, and fire (i.e., hearths) had multiplied themselves, and the earth had become too narrow for them, he uttered the following prayer :

*Fritha . spenta . ārmaite . fracha . shava . vicha . nemaġha . barethre .
pasvāmcha . staoranāmcha . masyānāmcha .* *Āat . yimō . imām . zām . vish-
āvayat . aeva . thrishva . ahmāt . masyehīm . yatha . para . ahmāt . as.*¹

‘Beloved Spentā Ārmati, extend and widen thyself, thou mother of cattle and of men.’ ‘Thus he (Yima) caused the earth to extend, whereby it became one-third larger than it was before.’

It is evident that Yima here addresses himself to Ārmati, as the genius of the earth. As such Ārmati alone can be distinguished by the epithet ‘bearer’ or ‘mother.’ In quite the same way it is said of the earth itself : ‘Together with other women we praise this Earth, who bears and nourishes us².’ Here the Earth is undoubtedly viewed as a person, and the author might as well have said ‘*Spentām Ārmatīm*’ as ‘*imām zām*’. Along with this idea an explanation is also at the same time given as to how humility could be made to be the protection of the earth. This comes from regarding the earth chiefly as the humble, suffering one, which bears all, nourishes all, and sustains all.

Moreover Ārmati is the only figure amongst the Amesha Spenta that may be traced as a personal deity to the Arian (Indo-Irānian) epoch. In the Rig-veda, Arināti is found to be *devotion or genius of devotion*, and it is characteristic that just here in the Vedas also, as very often in the Avesta, we cannot with certainty separate the abstract from the personal signification. By the Indian commentator Sāyana, Ārmati (Skt. *arumati*) is regarded as *Wisdom*, but, strange to say, he also defines the same word twice as ‘the Earth³.’

HARVATĀT and ĀMERTĀT⁴ form an inseparable pair. Their names signify ‘*invulnerability, good-preservation, health,*’ and ‘*undying long life, immortality.*’ They rule over the water and over plants. The Avesta does not, however, indicate this directly ; but we have for it the testimony of Neriōsengh, which does not contradict in any way the brief indications contained in it (the Avesta). In the Avesta, also, water and plants are always coupled together⁵.

The following invocation to these two genii is characteristic :

*Haurvatūtem . ameshem . spentem . yazamaide . yūiryām . hushitīm .
yazamaide . saredha . asharana . ashahe . ratavō . yez . . . Ameretūtem*

¹ Vend. II, 10, 11. Also Ys. XVI, 10, where Ārmati denotes ‘*maithana*,’ ‘a dwelling-place,’ might be referred to for comparison.

² Ys. XXXVIII, 1, *imām-āat . zām . genābish . hathrū . yazamaide*. In the designations that follow, the ‘*genāo*’ is on another occasion specially called ‘*ārmaitish*.’

³ Grassman, *Worterbuch* sub voce ; Spiegel, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. ii, p. 38.

⁴ Comp. Darmesteter, *Haurvatāt et Ameretāt*, in the *Bibliothèque de l’école des Hautes Etudes*, xxiii, 1875.

⁵ Yt. XV, 16 ; XIX, 32. Comp. Yt. XIII, 93. 94, where water and plants (*āpō . urvarāoscha*.) begin to increase with Zarathushtra’s birth.

*ameshem.spentem.yaz . . . fshaoni.vāthwa.yaz . . . aspinācha . yavinō
yaz . . . gaokerenem . sūrem . Mazdadhātem . yaz . . .*¹

'We praise Harvatāt, the Amesha Spenta; we praise the yearly good dwelling, and the years, the holy masters of holiness. We praise Amertāt, the Amesha Spenta; we praise the fields and herds; we praise the tree *Gaokerna*, the strong one, which Mazda created.'

Here Harvatāt rules over habitations, for every permanent dwelling place, particularly in the arid district of Eastern Irān, is dependent upon the presence of sufficient water. Amertāt rules over the fields and herds, since he causes the plants to germinate, and over the tree *Gaokerna*, which is itself the king of plants, and which gives immortality.

The connection between the abstract and the material meaning is not so clear in the case of any other Amesha Spenta as in that of Harvatāt and Amertāt. Harvatāt, '*healih*,' is therefore the master of water, for the waters are considered as dispensing health.

*Yayata . dunma . yayata . frū-āpem yaskahē . apanashtahe .
mahrkahe . apanashtahe*².— *Yō . vō . āpō . vaḡuhīsh . yazāitē .
ahurānīsh . Ahurahe ahmāi tanvō . dravatātem . . .*³

'Come, ye clouds, with your waters to drive away sickness, to drive away death.'—'Whosoever offers to you, you good waters, you daughters of Ahura on him you bestow health of body.

Something similar we learn of the plants. At the request of Thrīta, Ahura Mazda causes the wholesome plants . . . to sprout, 'in order to dispel sickness and death'⁴. It is especially the Haoma plant which is commended, as salutary: it keeps away death, and confers health of body and a long duration of the vital power⁵. In conclusion, we may call attention to the White Haoma, the enjoyment of which confers immortality.

In one word: water and plants bestow health and long life, happiness and immortality. Hence the conceptions of '*health*' and '*immortality*', which are exalted into personal genii. Harvatāt and Amertāt are their commanders, and form, like the latter, an inseparable couple.

III. THE ELEMENTS AND ELEMENTARY

YAZATAS.

We have already recognized in Asha-vahishta an Amesha Spenta of fire, and in Harvatāt an Amesha Spenta of water. Both these elements play an important part in the Avesta. But it is difficult to distinguish in individual instances, whether we should accept the personal or the material significance, whether we are on the domain of religion or on that of the *cultus*.

¹ Sirozah, II, 6, 7.

² Vend. XXI, 2.

³ Ys. LXVIII, 10, 11.

⁴ Vend. XX, 3 [*paitishtātē.yaskahē.paitishtātē.mahrkahē*].

⁵ [*Bacshazya, duraosha—dravatātem.tanvō, daregho-jitīm.ushtānahē*. Ys. IX, 6, 2 4, 19.]

What a wide space the *cultus* of fire occupies amongst Zoroastrians need not be mentioned. I have myself discussed it in the section on 'Prayers and Household Customs.' For my part I can hardly doubt that fire was conceived also as a *yazata*, but where the element alone is meant and where the *yazata* cannot be determined without difficulty; the lack of tangible materiality of shape in these *yazatas*, the constant clinging to the mere idea by which the entire Avesta is distinguished, appears here more manifestly prominent than anywhere else.

Fire is conceived as half personal and half material when at night it awakens a man from sleep and impels him to add fuel, so that it may not die out. The correct tendency of fire is accompanied simultaneously by a blessing¹.

The same sort of double meaning is met with when, with the several invocations at the beginning of the Yasna-ceremony, it is said: 'We invite thee, O Fire, thou son of Ahura Mazda!' ² Here the fire is undoubtedly intended to represent a *yazata*, but at the same time the priest, as is already manifest from the direct manner of address, has in view the holy fire, which burns before him upon the altar.

When it is said that the Fire and Vohu-mano stood up against Angra Manyu in order to check the injuries he was inflicting, Asha-vashishta may be directly meant by the Fire³.

Fire appears most thoroughly personified in the passage where it is named together with Vohu-manō and Asha-vahishta as an opponent of Dahāka:

*Yahmi · paiti · pareqūithē · spentascha · mainyush · aḡrascha · aētahmi ·
paiti · at · aqarete · adhāt · ashte · fraḡharechayat · āsishte · kataras-
chit. Spentō · mainyush · ashtem · fraḡharechayat · vohucha ·
manō · ashemcha · vahishtem · ātaremcha · Ahurahe · Mazdāo · puthrem ·
aḡrō-mainyush · ashtem · fraḡharechayat · akemcha · manō · aēsh-
memcha · khraivīdrūm · azhīmcha · dahākem · spityuremcha · yimo-
kerentem. Adhāt · frasha · hām-rūzayata · ātarsh · Mazdāo · Ahurahe
uiti · avatha · maḡhānō · aētat · qarenō · hangerefshūne · yat · aqaretem ·
Āat · he · paskūt · fradvarat · azhish · thrizafūo · duzhdaenō · uta ·
zakhshathrem · daomnō.*

¹ ['Arise, thou master of the house! put on thy garments, wash thy hands, long for some wood for me, bring it unto me, kindle the clean wood over me, with both thy well-washed hands.' After this address, the Fire blesses the man, who brings him dry wood with a righteous heart, in the following words: 'May herds of oxen follow thee, and of heroic sons in plenty: may thy mind develop through action, may thy soul develop through energy: all the (days and) nights that thou livest, mayest thou live in the delight of thy soul.' Vend. XVIII, 19, 27; Ys. LXII.—Tr. note.]

² *Nivaedhayemi · haḡkārāyemi · āthrō · Ahurahe · Mazdāo · puthra. Ys. I, 12; II, 12 III, 14; IV, 17.*

³ [*Yat · titarat · aḡrō · mainyush · dahēm · ashahē · vaḡhēush · aḡtar · pairi · avātem · vohucha · manō ātarshcha.*] Yt. XIII, 77.

*Inja · avat · haṇḍaṣayaṅuha · ātarsh · Mazdāo · Ahurahe · yezi · aetat · nyāsūōḡhe · yat · aqaretem · frā · thwām · paiti · apātha · nōit · apaya · uzruochayāi · zām · paiti · Ahuradhūtām · thrūthrūi · ashahe · gaēthanām*¹.

‘For the heavenly radiance fought the Blissful, and the Destructive Spirit for the imperishable. Then both of them sent forth their speediest messengers. The Blissful Spirit sent out as messengers Vohu-manō and Asha-vahishta, and Fire, the son of Ahura Mazda. But the Evil Spirit sent forth as messengers Akem-manō, and Aeshma with bloody lances, and Azi Dahāka, and Spityura who sawed to pieces Yima. Then flamed up the Fire of Ahura Mazda, thinking, “I will seize for myself the heavenly splendour,” but behind him ran the three-headed evil dragon striving for his destruction.

Ho there ! let me see thou Fire of Ahura Mazda ; if thou withholdest it from me, then will I not let thee shine in future upon the earth, which Mazda created for the protection of pious men.’

Now the Fire lets the heavenly radiance slip from his hands. Dahāka takes possession of it, but the Fire compels the Demon to surrender again the heavenly splendour, which is secured in the sea Vouru-Kasha.

Here Fire is introduced as thinking, speaking and acting : it is a personal *yazata*. But in most cases we have to do only with the mere element itself. Thus, for instance, when the fire is divided into different classes. So too the *hwareno* ‘the heavenly radiance,’ is very likely an attribute of the Deity, but not a deity itself. On the other hand we can fairly conceive Naryo-saṅha as a *yazata* of fire.

NARYO-S AṂHA is the messenger of Ahura Mazda², just as the Vedic Indians designate the fire-god, *Agni*, as the ‘messenger’ of gods³. Indeed the Deity sends down the fire from heaven, as lightning or sun-fire, to the earth, while on the other hand the fire burning upon the altar carries upwards the prayers and gifts of men to God.

Naryo-saṅha together with Srausha is the companion of Mithra⁴. He bears a club, by which the flash of lightning is probably to be understood. In the Brahmanical hymns also the genii fighting in the brunt of the battle are armed with clubs. It is for once allowable, in the present case, to introduce Vedic incidents for comparison, for even the name of Naryo-saṅha is found under the almost literally similar form *Naraçam̐sa*, as an appellative of the fire-god Agni.

¹ Yt. XIX, 46—48.

² Vend. XIX, 34 : *ashto·Mazdāo·Ahurahe* ; or perhaps *astō* (?) ‘the embodying of Mazda.’

³ *Dātā*, Rig-veda I, 44, 2 ; I, 72, 7, and frequently elsewhere.

⁴ Yt. X, 52. Along with Srausha we also find the name of Naryo-saṅha in Ys. LVII, 3.

APĀM-NAPĀT forms the transition from the *fire-yazatas* to the *water-yazatas*. The name signifies 'son of the waters,' and must have originally designated the flame of lightning, so far as it dwells in the clouds and is born of the clouds.

For that reason Apām-napāt is invoked with Naryo-saḡha, who is however undoubtedly a fire-yazata, but often also with the waters to which he stands in close relation ¹.

In the Vedic hymns also Apām-napāt is mentioned. This deity was thus invoked by the Arians even before Zarathushtra established his new doctrine. There too he is the fire of lightning dwelling in the clouds. Here the virgin waters foster and nourish him, until he bursts forth out of the clouds in bright-shining lustre. In quite a similar way is Apām-napāt pictured in the Avesta:

*Berezantem · ahurem · khshathrīm · khshaetem · apāmnapātem · aurvat-aspem · yazamaide · arshūem · zavanōsūm · yō · nerēush · dadha · yō · nerēush · tatasha · yō · upāpo · yazatō · srut-quoshōtemō · asti · yazemnō*².

'The great lord, the king-like, bright Apām-napāt with his war-steeds, we praise, the *hero* who blesses invocation, who made men, who formed men, who, the yazata of the waters, listens most propitiously when he is invoked.'

Here we observe that Apām-napāt, according to the Zoroastrian idea, participates in the work of the creation; the formation of men is specially ascribed to him. This also corresponds again with the Vedic conceptions of Apām-napāt, of whom it is said: 'The son of the waters, in the strength of his deity, benignly created all the creatures.'³

Even when it is said,

*Apām-napāosc · tāo · āpō · Spitama · Zarathushtra · aḡuḡe · astavaite · shōūthrō-bakhtāo · vibakhshaiti · vātascha · yō · darshish · uwzh-dātemcha · qarenō · ashaonāmcha · fravashayō*⁴,

'Apām-napāt spreads the waters given to the fields, O son of Spitama, Zarathushtra! upon the corporeal world, and Vāta (*the wind*) the strong one,'

I do not consider Apām-napāt to be a *water-yazata*. This may only mean that with the flashing of lightning (Apām-napāt) and the roar of the stormy-wind (Vāta) the fertilizing rain pours down upon the earth.

If now we proceed to speak of the waters themselves, we again stand more upon the ground of *cultus* than upon that of religion. The importance of water for life and culture in Eastern Irān, I have frequently enough and pointedly alluded to in the course of my 'History of Civilization.' It is therefore

¹ Ys. LXXI, 23; Ys. I, 5; II, 5, &c. Even the epithet 'shining' (*khshaeta*) characterizes Apām-napāt as a fire-yazata.

² Yt. XIX, 52.

³ Rig-Veda II, 35, 2.

⁴ Yt. VIII, 34.

conceivable that this element stood in high veneration. But also in invocations such as the following,

*Nivaēdhayemi · hankārayemi · aiwyō · vaḡuhibyō · vīspanāmcha · apām · Mazdadhātānām · vispanāmcha · urvaranām · Mazdadhātānām*¹

‘We announce it, and invite the good waters, all waters which Mazda created, and all the plants which Mazda created,’

water is only meant as an element. To the dignity of a *yazata* it is not exalted.

The proper *water-yazata* is ARDVI-SŪRA ANĀHITA.

The veneration of this female *yazata* is a special property of the Irānian religion, and has its history. For I believe that Ardvī-sūra was originally the name of a large river, the Oxus. This appears very clearly in certain descriptions and eulogies of the Avesta :

(*Ardvim · sūrām · anāhitām · yazamaide*) · *yā · asti · avavaiti · masō · yatha · vīspāo · imāo · āpō · yāo · zemā · paiti · fratachanti · yū · amavaiti · fratachaiti · hukairyāt · hacha · berezaḡhat · avi · zrayō · vourukashem · yaozenti · vīspē · karanō · zrayā · vourukashayā · ā · vīspō · maidhyō · yaozaiti · yat · hīsh · avi · fratachaiti · yat · hīsh · avi · frazhgaraiti · ardvī · sūra · anāhita · yeḡhe · hazaḡrem · vairya-nām · hazaḡrem · apaghzhāranām, · kaschitcha · aēshām · vairyanām · kaschitcha · aēshām · apaghzhāranām · chathwāresatem · ayare-baranām · hvaspāi · nairē · baremnāi*².

‘(The Ardvī-sūra Anāhita we praise), which is as large as all other waters that flow over the earth, which powerfully streams down from the Mount Hukarya into the sea Voru-kasha. All the shores are covered with waves, all the middle heavens up in the sea Voru-kasha, when into it streams down, when into it flows, the Ardvī-sūra Anāhita. That has a thousand arms and a thousand canals; and each of these arms and each of these canals is as long as forty days’ journey for a well-mounted man.’

We have here undoubtedly the picture of a mighty river of great volume with many tributary streams and branches. But if we look to the original dwellings of the Avesta people, as they appear from the geographical indications of the text, there is no doubt that ‘Ardvī-sūra’ can mean only the Oxus for which on the opposite supposition we would have no designation at all. At the same time the name Ardvī-sūra Anāhita does not merely designate the stream by itself, but also the *yazata* to whom the stream is dedicated, and who rules over it. Hence these words can be put into her mouth :

*Mana · raya · qarenaḡhacha · pasvascha · staorūcha · upairi · zām · vīcharenti · mashyūcha · bizangra · nipayemi · vīspa · vohū · Mazdadhāta (usha-chithra) · mānāyen · ahe · yatha · pasūm · pasu-vastrem*³.

¹ Ys. 1, 12.

² Yt. V, 3, 4; Ys. LXV, 3, 4,

³ Yt. V, 89,

‘Through my riches and my splendour, sheep and cattle wander on the earth, and two-legged men. I protect for them all the good things which Mazda created, just as a fold shelters (or as the fleece protects) the flock.’

From the *yazata* of the largest and holiest stream to the *yazata* of water in general there is indeed only a small step.

Ardvi-sûra Anâhita is one of those *yazatas* in the Avesta who were most completely moulded into a tangible personality. As a female *yazata*, Anâhita is also especially the guardian of the female sex. Her work in that respect is described in the following passage :

*Yā · vîspanām · arshnūm · khshudrūo · yaozhdadhūiti · yū · vîspanām · hāirishinām · zāthāi · garewān · yaozhdadhūiti · yū · vîspanām · hāirishish · huzāmītō · dadhūiti · yū · vîspanām · hāirishinām · dāitīm · rathwīm · paēma · ava-baraiti*¹.

‘That governs the generation of all men (lit., purifies the seed of all men), that prepares the bodies of all women for delivery, that gives sufficient and well-timed milk to all women.’

To the fire and water *yazatas* may be added without hesitation VAYU or RĀMAN, and VĀTA, the *yazatas* of the air and storm-wind.

Like all *yazatas* of nature, Vayu and Vāta are also thrown into the shade in the Avesta. The latter is designated ‘the strong one,’ and ‘created by Mazda² ;’ further than this we learn nothing particular about him. Vayu occupies a somewhat larger space, and is called the strong and the swift one. The influence of Vayu is tolerably extensive ; however one can scarcely say whether it stands in closer relation to his nature as the *yazata* of the air or as that of the wind. Unmarried maidens pray to him for husbands who may take care of them and beget offspring by them³. His name, however, is also invoked in the heat of battle with hostile armies, when violent tyrants reign in the land, when heretics attack the purity of religion, or when a person is betrayed into the hands of his enemy⁴.

On the whole, Vayu may be characterized as the strong, robust, warlike helper in every danger. With man and horse he drives away anxious fear and suspense, he drives away the demons⁵, and hence it is said of him :—

Vayush · aurvō · uskāt · yāstō · derezrō · yaokhdhrō · berezipādhō · perethu-varō . . . anākhraūdha-dōilhra · yatha · . . anyāoschit · khshathrāt · khshayamnāo · hamōkhshathrō-khshayamnāo.⁶

‘Vayu is armed and warlike, powerful, martial, highfooted, with a wide chest, and a tender glance, like the others that rule over kingdoms as sovereigns.’

¹ Yt. V, 2.

² Yt. XV, 39

³ Yt. XV, 53.

² Vend. XIX, 13 ; Ys. XLII, 3.

⁴ Yt. XV, 49—52.

⁶ Yt. XV, 54.

IV. STAR-YAZATAS.

Amongst the *star-yazatas*, the SUN (*Hvare*), the MOON (*Māoṇha*), and the 'BEGINNINGLESS STARS' (*Anaghra Raochāo*), deserve to be first considered. The rain-star TISHTRYA is also worthy of mention, and in remote relation to them stand also the FRAVASHIS, the *manes* or spirits of the defunct, so far at least as they were apparently considered to be stars.

I can and indeed must express myself only briefly upon this subject, since I have had occasion to discuss it in my 'History of Civilization,' in the section upon 'The World.'

The SUN, as the bearer of light, is the chief opponent of the demons. He is *the eye of heaven, the eye of Ahura Mazda*. The *Yazata of the Sun* is represented as driving in a bright shining chariot which is drawn by celestial horses.

The MOON is the lamp of the night. To her is ascribed a mysterious influence upon the growth of plants. Deserving of attention is her constant epithet *gaochilhra*, 'containing the seed of cattle,' by which is perhaps indicated her influence upon the increase of herds.

By the name BEGINNINGLESS LIGHTS are probably meant the stars. Amongst them *Tishtrya* is the principal one. He is Sirius in the constellation of Canis Major. The veneration in which he is held is connected with the fact that he first rises in midsummer, and that the longer he remains in the heavens the sooner the heat will diminish and the autumnal rain appear instead of sultry weather and barrenness.

Thus *Tishtrya* becomes the dispenser of rain. It is he who opens the heavenly fountains, and thereby increases the waters in springs and rivulets, in rivers and in seas. His opponent is the demon of heat, APAUSHA, whom he conquers after a desperate combat. The helper of *Tishtrya* in the work of distributing the waters over the earth is the star SATAVAESA, which I believe to be Vega in the constellation of Lyra.

With the FRAVASHIS, the *manes*, we are again concerned more with the *cultus*. I have devoted a special chapter to the *cultus of the manes*. They are helpers in every necessity and danger. They protect habitations, supply them with water, and cause them to attain prosperity. They are helpers in war, and assist in the maintenance and preservation of the world's system and its laws. That they are regarded as stars is apparent from the description of them as wandering through the height of the firmament with a celestial escort.

V. ABSTRACT IDEAS AS NAMES OF SPIRITUAL BEINGS.

The Avesta religion differs essentially from the religion of kindred nations, more particularly in the fact that in it the sensible and the material appear to fall into the background when opposed to the purely spiritual, ethical, and ideal. The names of the six Amesha Spenta, the highest spiritual essences of the entire system, are indeed all abstract ideas, and are, moreover, still employed as such in the sacred writings.

Thus it cannot surprise us, if in addition a whole series of abstract ideas and ethical conceptions are formed into holy names, into more or less personal angels.

I shall not here discuss the fact that in the prayers and invocations of the Avesta are also named the *Daena*, the *Holy Doctrine*, *The Law*, or *Māthra Spenta*, the *Holy Word*, or *Sauka* probably 'the Blessing.' They were exactly things which appeared in themselves worthy of veneration and at the same time desirable. If, therefore, any one in praying invokes them, or rather desires their coming, it is not thereby implied that they are real *yazatus*., Indeed it is difficult to draw the necessary distinction.

Such an abstract idea is ARSHTĀT or ARSHTI, who is invoked together with RASHNU¹. Both these *yazatus*, as the etymological connection of their names of itself indicates, appear to be essentially cognate.

Rashnu, however, is undoubtedly the genius of justice. He is called *ashavan* 'the holy,' *razishta* 'the just,' *vaidhishta* 'the knowing,' *vichōistare* 'the discerning,' he who also perceives what is remote, *durac-darshtema* 'the far-seeing'.² In short he is the *yazata* before whose penetrating eye nothing lies hidden. It may therefore be easily understood that he is a particular enemy of thieves, and above all of wicked men, whose deeds shun the light of day.³ It is likewise clear why Rashnu appears amongst the Judges of the Dead. It is he who weighs the good and the bad deeds of each soul against each other, and who always passes sentence according to the result.

We will hardly err, therefore, in looking upon Arshtāt simply as 'Justice' personified.

The number of the abstract ideas in which, according to the doctrine of the Avesta, a certain sanctity is involved, and which therefore occur in invocations along with active and personal *yazatus*, is rather considerable. Many of them are not quite clear. Amongst the doubtful ideas I reckon UPARATĀT perhaps 'Victory,' next DĀMOISH UPAMANA, about which I can say almost nothing for certain, then ĀFRITĪ 'Benediction' of pious men, possessing divine strength and efficacy, and lastly RASĀSTĀT, probably again something similar to Justice, and others.

VERETHRAGHNA, SRAUSHA and ASHI-VAGHVĪ are of a more definite character.

Verethraghna is without doubt 'Victory' or 'the *yazata* of victory.' This is quite evident from his being chiefly invoked in battle :

Kva • asti • verethraghnahe • Ahuradhātahē • nāma • azbāitish ? kva • upastūtish ? kva • nistūtish ?.... Yat • spūthū • ha : jasōntē • rashtem •

¹ Ys. I, 7 ; II, 7

² Yt. XII, 7. *Vichōistare* from the root *vichit* ; *parakavistema*.

³ Yt. XII, 7, 8.

*rasma · kataraschit · vishtaojho · ahmya · nôit · vanyāontē · jataojho
ahmya · nôit · janyāontē.... yatarô · pourvô · frāyazaitē · amô ·
hutāshô · huraothô · verethraghnô · Ahuradhātô · alārô · verethra ·
hachaitē*¹.

‘When occurs the invocation of the name of Verthraghna ? When his praise ? When his (conjunction) hearing ? When armics dash against each other, drawn up in battle array, then to one of the two, not conquered, not smitten...who first invokes the well-created, well-formed Strength, Verthraghna, whom Ahura created : to his lot the victory falls.’

It is he, who ‘commands amongst the lines of battle arrayed for the fight’². It is he, who ‘crushes the battalions, who separates and smites them, who shakes them violently’³.

He ties behind them the hands of the breakers of covenants, he blinds their power of vision, he deafens their ears, and unnerves their feet, so that they cannot offer any resistance⁴.

It is remarkable that Verthraghna is also pictured ‘in the form of a rich man who carries a sword with a golden hilt, a jewelled, an embellished and a richly ornamented one’⁵.

Finally, we must notice that he is identified with Vāta, the boisterous storm-god.⁶ This carries us back to Indra, the *Vritrahan* of the Rig-veda, the god who fights in storm and thunder against the demons. Evidently Verethraghna may be traced to such a natural deity of the Indo-Irānian epoch, with this difference that that god was transformed after the Zoroastrian manner of thinking. His functions as a nature-god were lost sight of. Verthraghna is, according to the Mazdayasnān belief, no longer the fighter in the thunder-storm, but in general the genius of victory, and the pious are indebted to his help, if they overpower the unbelieving in battle.

A most characteristic figure in the Avesta religion is SRAUSHA. He too exemplifies clearly the ethico-philosophical spirit which predominates in the Zarathushtrian system. Srausha means ‘obedience,’ and especially obedience towards the Holy Word and its Commandments. Hence Srausha is the principal opponent of the demons, who endeavour to lead man to violate those commandments and to neglect his religious duties.

¹ Yt. XIV, 42-43.

² [*Yô · virāzaiti · anīare · rāshta · rasmana.*] Yt. XIV, 47.

³ [*Yô · rasmanô · schindayēiti · yô · rasmanô · kerēntayēiti · yô · rasmanô · qaghayēiti · yô · rasmanô · yaozayēiti.*] Yt. XIV, 62.

⁴ Yt. XIV, 7—25.

⁵ [*Verethraghnô · virāhē · kehrpa · raqvatô · barat · karctem · zaranyô-saorem · frapikhshētem · vispo-pasaghem.*] Yt. XIV, 27.

⁶ Yt. XIV, 1, 2.

Ahura Mazda has created Srausha as the opponent of *Aeshma*, the demon of 'violent wrath'¹. Whoever follows the Zoroastrian Law must suppress the passion of anger. Srausha is, besides, the adversary of *Bushyāsta*, the evil spirit of 'indolence,' who, in the morning, entices man to give himself up to sleep.² 'Obedience' to the Law requires us to wake early and to set about our daily business; for even in the morning a series of ritual and religious duties await the Worshipper of Mazda. Similarly Srausha fights against the demons of 'drunkenness'³, for the doctrine of Zarathushtra demands a frugal, prudent life.

If the name of Srausha means obedience to the Holy Law, it is very easy to explain why the introduction of certain ritual precepts is ascribed to him. It is he, who first of all recited the sacred hymns, who first tied together the *Baresma*, the consecrated sacrificial branches, in honour of Ahura Mazda, the Amesha Spenta, and Mithra; but he is also expressly styled the Teacher of the Law⁴. It is likewise intelligible why the holy prayers are the weapons with which he conquers the demons⁵.

In other respects also the power of Srausha is naturally explained from that *single* point of view. Srausha pities the poor and the needy, since the Law commandeth charity towards the members of the same faith. He guards, like Mithra, the sanctity of covenants, as these are particularly sacred to the Zoroastrian. He takes part also in battles, for the Zoroastrian Law desires from its adherents an unswerving adhesion to its doctrine⁷. He is lastly called *tanu-māthra*⁸, 'he whose body is the Holy Word,' because in him obedience towards the precepts of that Word and their fulfilment appear to be embodied.

Thus we have succeeded in deriving from one fundamental idea, which can be recognized in the very meaning of the name, all the powers of Srausha and all the notions which cluster round that *yazata* in the Avesta. Something similar is, perhaps, also possible with regard to the female *yazata* ASHI, or, more fully, ASHI-VAGHVĪ.

Ashi is 'Piety' in the broad sense which the Mazdayasnān give to that idea—'the moral order.' Hence she is called, in an allegorical manner, the daughter of Ahura and of Spentā Ārmatī, the Humble Devotion, and the sister of Srausha, Rashnu, Mithra, and of the Mazdayasnān Religion⁸. She

¹ Yt. XI, 15 (Comp. also Ys. LVII, 10), *aeshmahe·hamaestārem*.

² Vend. XVIII, 16.

³ Vend. XIX, 41 [*Sraoshō·ashyō·kundem·bangem·vibangem·ava-janyāt*.]

⁴ Ys. LVII, 8, 2 and 24 [*Yō (sraoshō) daēnō-disō·daēnayōō. Yō·paōiryō·gāthāō. frasrāvayat·mat-āzaitish·mat-paiti-frasōō*].

⁵ Ys. LVII, 22.

⁷ Vd. XVIII, 14.

⁶ Ys. LVII, 10; Yt. XI, 14; Ys. LVII, 12.

⁸ Yt. XVII, 16; XVII, 2 [*(dughdharem·Ahurahr·Mazdāō)*. (16) *Pita·tē·yō·Ahuro, Mazdāō. . . māta·ārmaitish·spenta·brāta·te·yō·sraoshō·ashyō·rashnuhcha, mithrascha . . . gāthā·daena·māzdayasnish*.]

is most closely and intimately coupled with all the virtues which mark the Zoroastrian.

As the protectress of the moral order, Ashi bestows the human intellect, by which we must probably understand the faculty of distinguishing between good and evil¹. She is, further, the defender of matrimony. She abhors courtesans and adulteresses, who violate this institute of the moral order. She hates those who keep a maiden by force from marriage, and thus withhold her from her destination.² In general she displays her activity chiefly in the house, probably because the entire moral order rests upon the narrow circle of the family. She is therefore invited into one's own house :

*Ashi · srīra · dāmi-dāite · mū · avi · asmanem · frashūsa · mā · avi · zām · niurvaēse · ilha · me · tūm · hāmcharaījuha · antare · aredhem · nmānahe · srīrahe · khshathrô-keretahe*³.

‘ Beautiful Ashi, created by the Creator, go not up into heaven, nor down to the earth ; come thou to me into the interior of my house, of the fine, lordly one.’

The blessings which Ashi bestows are very multifarious. She confers power and riches, gold and silver, garments and shining rings, and to maidens she grants the beauty with which they please their husbands⁴. She was in close friendship with Zarathushtra as the founder of piety, but now too she presents herself to him who invokes her to unite herself with him⁵.

By way of appendix we shall discuss in this section a genius that occupies a separate position and cannot be included in any of the groups treated of hitherto. It is GEUSH—URVAN, ‘ the Soul of the Bull,’ also called DRUVĀSPA.

We have under the name Geush-urvan undoubtedly an embodiment or concentration of the welfare and prosperity of herds. She is their representative, who has to defend their interest.

Just as in the oldest periods of Zoroastrian civilization the occupations of agriculture and cattle-breeding played a very important part, so is it easy to understand why Geush-urvan occurs already in the Gāthās. Here a song⁶ is found, in which the ‘ Soul of the Bull ’ complains before the Deity of all the oppressions and dangers which are inflicted upon her by enemies, evidently the plundering nomads. Ahura predicts to her the future mission of Zarathushtra, who will indeed not merely be the founder of a new religion, but who will also confer upon men at the same time the blessings of civilization, imposing upon them as a duty a settled life, the cultivation of the field, and the careful rearing of cattle.

¹ Yt. XVII, 2 (Yā · (ashī) frasha · khrathwa · frāthasajayēiti · uta · āsnem-khratūm. avabaraiti.]

² Yt. XVII, 57—59.

⁴ Yt. XVII, 6.

⁶ Yt. XXIX.

³ Yt. XVII, 60.

⁵ Yt. XVII, 1, 21 ; Yt. XIII, 107.

So also in the later Avesta, Druvāspa is the protectress of herds, though we do not learn any particulars regarding her. Her work is described in a general way at the beginning of the Yasht dedicated to her, where it is said :

*Druvāspem · yazamaide · druvō-pasvām · druvō-staorām · druvō-urva-thām · druvō-aperenūyukām · pouruspakhshtīm · dūrāt-pathana · gūthravana · dareghō-hakhedrayana · yukhta-aspām · vareto-rathām · ganat-chakhrām · fshaonīm · marczām · amavaitīm · huraodhām · qūsuokām · baeshazyām · druvō-stūilīm · druvō-varekūm · avājhe · narām · ashaonām*¹.

‘Druvāspa we praise, who keeps small cattle and large cattle, friends and children in vigour ; who grants ample protection, appearing from afar, dispensing good-luck, long-continuing friendship ; who yokes her steeds, makes her chariot roll, the wheels to rattle, granting nourishment, purifying, strong, well-shaped ; who grants good profits ; who renders powerful support ; who possesses rich treasures for the assistance of the pious people.’

VI. MITHRA.

MITHRA is no doubt one of the most interesting genii of the Zoroastrians. In him are combined, as in no other figure of the Avesta religion, old and new, Arian and especially Irānian, symbolical parts of nature, and ethical constituents. But Mithra is also at the same time a manifest instance of the manner in which, in the Avesta, the deities originating from a pre-Zoroastrian epoch are usually conceived and transformed according to the new spirit. Hence it would appear proper to devote a particular section to Mithra.

The great number of hymns which are united in the Mithra-Yasht, may of themselves prove the important place which the veneration of Mithra held in the nation. He was perhaps one of the most popular *yazatas* ; and just for that reason, I believe, he had in the system itself to rank after the purely ethical genii and abstract ideas, as for example the Amesha Spenta.

Mithra has his physical and his moral sides. The latter is founded on the former, and proceeds from it. The two should be strictly distinguished.

Physically, Mithra is the *yazata* of the rising sun, or, more accurately, probably the *yazata* of the light radiating from the sun.

*Mithrem · yazamaide · yō · paoiryō · mainyavō · yazatō · tarō · harām · ūsnaoiti · paura-naemāt · ameshahē · hū · yat · aurvat-aspahē · yō · paoiryō · zaranjō-pisō · srīrāo · bareshnava · gerewnāiti · adhāt · vispem · ādidhāiti · airjō-shayanem · sevishtō*².

‘We praise Mithra, who, as the first heavenly *yazata*, rises above the Hara, before the immortal sun, the swift-horse ; who first, gold-modelled, surrounds the beautiful mountain-summits and then looks over the entire land of the Arians, the helpful.’

¹ Yt. IX, 1, 2.

² Yt. X, 13 ; comp. also Yt. X, 95.

The description of sunrise, which forms the basis of these lines, may be still clearly perceived. On the *Hara barzati*, the mountain over which the sun rises, Ahura Mazda has erected for Mithra a dwelling. Yonder there is neither night nor darkness, neither cold nor heat, neither sickness nor grief, and no fog ascends from the mountain¹.

As the *yazata* of sun and light, Mithra is called *vourugaoyaoiti* 'the lord over wide fields².' He is also named *dañhu-paiti* 'the prince of the countries³.' For the sun is the king of the heavens, and he looks at the same time over all the dominions of the earth.

The light is the symbol of truth. Hence the sun is called the eye of Ahura, because with it he surveys the whole world and perceives everything right and wrong. When once such ideas exist, it cannot surprise us that also Mithra, the *yazata* of the sun-light, should himself become a guardian of truth and justice. If we look more closely into the entire character of the Avesta religion, we shall find it intelligible that this ethical part of the nature of Mithra occupies a far wider space than his physical importance.

Mithra is the guardian of truth, the *yazata* of oaths and promises. As such Mithra is *adhaoyamna* 'the infallible,' and 'the undeceived one⁴.' In an allegorical manner this is expressly indicated by the Avesta, when it says: 'he has a thousand ears (*hazañrô-gaoshem*⁵) and ten thousand eyes (*baçvare-chashmanem*)⁶.' He neither rests nor sleeps, he hears and sees everything that happens⁷. His scouts are posted on high watch-towers and announce to him what passes on the earth.⁸

As is usually the case with the deities of the sun in the Arian religion, so also in the Avesta is Mithra described as a warlike courageous youth who drives in a chariot through the spaces of the heavens:

*Akmya · vāshe · vazāontē · chathwādrō · aurvantō · spaçtita · hama
gaonāoñhō · mainyush-qaretha · anaoshūoñhō*⁹.

'Four horses draw his chariot, white ones, of the same colour, which eat the heavenly food, (and are) immortal.'

¹ Yt. X, 50.

² Yt. X, 1, 7, 10, 12, &c.

³ Yt. X, 78 [*mithrō.raçvō.dañhu-paitish*; Yt. X, 145, *mithrem .viçpanām.daçyunañm dañhu-paitim.yazamaide*].

⁴ Yt. X, 24 and often.

⁵ Yt. X, 1, 7, 10, 12, &c.; Ys. I, 3; II, 3.

⁶ Yt. X, 1, 7, 10, 12, &c.; Ys. I, 3; II, 3.

⁷ Yt. X, 102, 103 [*mithrem.agafnem.jaghāurvāo ðhem . . . yō (mithrō) anava ðhabdemnō. za:naghā.nipāiti. Mazdāo.dāmān.yō.anava ðhabdemnō .zaena ðha .nishhaurvaiti .Mazdāo. dāmān.*]

⁸ Yt. X, 45, 46. It should also be remarked that *Mithra* in the Yasna and the Vendidad simply means 'covenant, promise.'

⁹ Yt. X, 125.

In this chariot Mithra drives into the battle, in order to support his adherents and to annihilate the ' betrayers of Mithra ' (*mithrô-druj*), by whom we must probably understand the enemies of the Zoroastrians in general :

*Āt • yat • mithrô • fravazaiti • avi • haēnayō • khravīshyēitīsh • avi •
lūm • yanta • rasmaoyō • anlarē • dağhapāperetānē. athra • narām •
mithrô-drujām • apāsh • gavō • durezayēiti • pairi • daēma • vīrayēiti •
apa • gaosha • gaoshayēiti*¹.

' When Mithra thither drives against the terrible hostile armies, against those thus gathered together for fight, in the battle of the countries then he binds the arms of the *betrayers of Mithra* to their backs, then he blinds their sight, and deafens their ears.'

This idea being amplified, Mithra becomes in general a *yazatu* of war :

*Vazrem • zastaya • drazhemnô • salafshātēm • satādārem • fravaeghem •
vīrô-nyāonchem • zarōish • ayuğhō • frahikhēm • amavalō • zaranyehe •
amavastemem • zaēnām • verethravastemem • zaēnām*².

' He bears a club in his hand, with a hundred knobs, and a hundred edges, that sweeps downwards, crushing men, cast out of yellow brass, out of solid, gold-coloured (brass), which is the most powerful and most victorious of weapons.'

With his club he slays his opponents, the men and horses together³. He is, therefore, invoked by warriors both for strength for their teams and health for their bodies⁴.

VII. DEMONOLOGY.

The question how evil, sin and guilt, grief and misfortune, come into this world has engaged Philosophy in all ages. For Zoroastrianism it was particularly important, since that system does not attribute to the divine beings any of the human passions and faults, but only recognizes in them pure, holy, absolutely good existences.

The Zoroastrian doctrine has accordingly solved that question by main taining from the beginning a dualism of forces, one good and beneficent, and another evil and destructive. The former is essentially represented by SPENTO MANYU ; the latter by his opponent ANGRA MANYU. As Ahura has a group of archangels and angels near Him, who support Him in His work, so is Angra Manyu surrounded by a body of evil spirits and demons.

¹ Yt. X, 48.

² Yt. X, 96.

³ Yt. X, 101.

⁴ Yt. X, 94.

On account of this opposition of good and evil, Zoroastrianism has been often called a dualistic religion ; but the title cannot be considered correct¹. It is true the evil power co-exists from the beginning with the good one, but as I have explained more distinctly in the chapter on the ' Eschatology ' of the Avesta², it will be overthrown in the great decisive combat at the end of the world, and will be annihilated.

The highest amongst the evil spirits, the prince of the demons, is Angra Manyu ' the evil pernicious spirit.' That he existed along with Ahura Mazda (or Spento Manyu ' the blissful spirit ') from the beginning, is expressed clearly enough in the Gāthās. The former rules over evil, and the evil-minded ones collect around him ; the latter is the Father and Creator of everything good. He is worshipped and followed by the pious and faithful.

At · tū · mainyū · paouruṇe · yā · yēmū · qafnā · asravātem ·
Manahichā · vachahichā · shkyaothandī · hī · vahyō · akemchā ·
Āoschā · huđāōjhō · eresh · vīshyātū · nōit · duždāōjhō ·
At · chā · hyat · tū · hēm · mainyū · jasaetem · paourvīm · dazde.
Gaemchā · ajyātīmchā · yathāchā · aghat · apemem · aghush.
Achishtō · dregvatām · at · ashaone · vahisitem · manō³.

' The two spirits who first of all existed, the twins proclaimed to me of themselves.

The good and the bad in thoughts, words, and works,

' And of those two the intelligent selected the right one, but fools did not so.

When the two spirits came first together, in order to create

Life and death, and (to order) how the world should be at the end,

Then the most evil one appeared on the side of the impious, but the best spirit appeared on that of the pious.'

¹ [Cf. Haug, *Essays*, p. 303 : ' The opinion, so generally entertained now, that Zarathushtra preached a Dualism, that is to say, the idea of two original independent spirits, one good and the other bad, utterly distinct from each other, and one counteracting the creation of the other, is owing to a confusion of his philosophy with his theology. Having arrived at the grand idea of the unity and indivisibility of the Supreme Being, he undertook to solve the great problem which has engaged the attention of so many wise men of antiquity, and even of modern times, viz., how are the imperfections discoverable in the world, the various kinds of evils, wickedness and baseness, compatible with the goodness, holiness, and justice of God ? This great thinker of remote antiquity solved this difficult question *philosophically* by the supposition of two primeval causes, which, though different, were united, and produced the world of material things, as well as that of the spirit ; which doctrine may best be learned from Ys. XXX (*vide* pp. 149-151).'

Cf. also *West Pahlavi Texts*, Part II, Introduction, p. xxiv : ' The reader will search in vain for any confirmation of the foreign notion that Mazda-worship is decidedly more dualistic than Christianity is usually shown to be by orthodox writers, or for any allusion to the descent of the good and evil spirits from a personification of boundless time, as asserted by strangers to the faith. No attempt is made to account for the origin of either spirit, but the temporary character of the power of the evil one, and of the punishment in hell, is distinctly asserted.' *Translator's note.*

² *Vide* § IV, p. 183.

³ Ys. XXX, 3, 4.

It is likewise clear that the doctrine respecting the powers co-existing from the beginning and standing diametrically opposed to one another, is expressed in the following passage :—

*At · fravakhshyā · aṅhēush · mainyū · paouruṇe ·
Yayāo · spanyāo · uilī · mruvat · yēm · aṅrēm ·
Nōit · nū · manāo · nōit · sēṅghā · nōit · khratavō ·
Naēdā · varanā · nōit · ukhdhā · naēdā · shkyaothanā ·
Nōit · daēnā · nōit · urvānō · hachaintī*¹.

‘ Announce will I the two spirits at the beginning of the world :

Of them spake the blissful also unto the destructive :

“ Neither our thoughts, nor our commands, nor our intelligence,

Nor our belief, nor our speeches, nor our deeds,

Nor our doctrines, nor our souls correspond.” ’

In all things Angra Manyu is the counterpart of Ahura Mazda (or Spento Manyu). The latter brings forth only what is good, the former only what is evil ; the one creates life, the other death. Hence Angra Manyu is designated by the constant appellation *pouru-mahrka*², ‘ he who is entire death.’

Whoever causes goodness injures at the same time the evil spirit. No wonder then if Zarathushtra, who brought to men the true faith and the right piety, is regarded as the special opponent of Angra Manyu. With his birth the latter bursts out into the following cry of complaint and of rage :

*Zātō · be · yō · ashava · Zarāthushtrō · nmānaḥ · Pourushaspaḥ ·
kava · he · aoshō · viṇdāma · hāu · daēvanām · snathō · hāu · daēvanām ·
paityārō · hāu · drukhsh-vīdrukhsh · nyāonchō · daēvayīzō*³.

‘ Born, alas ! is the holy Zarathushtra in the house of Porushaspa.

How can we contrive his destruction ? He is a blow against the

Daevas, he withstands the *Daevas*, he is an opponent of the *Drujas* ;

the worshippers of the demons shall fall down headlong !’

As Ahura Mazda is surrounded by the Amesha Spenta and Yazatas, the great majority of the beneficent spirits, so is Angra Manyu by the demons. The kingdom of the former is the light, the kingdom of the latter is the night and darkness.

The demons are designated by the names of DAEVA and DRUJ. The former are male, the latter are female devils. Of the great body of the evil spirits, some appear more conspicuous, others less. On the whole, it may perhaps be said that in the Avesta the kingdom of evil is not quite so exactly and fully described as that of the celestial spirits.

¹ Ys. XLV, 2 ; here the evil spirit is designated by the word *aṅrēm*.

² Pahlavi, *pūr-marg*.

³ Vd. XIX, 46.

It will therefore be necessary to say only a few words on this head. To the Amesha Spenta correspond a group of six demons, who in every respect, often even in very name, are opposed to the former, in the same way as their chief and prince himself is opposed to Ahura Mazda. They form the immediate associates, to some extent, the court of Angra Manyu. Against Vohu-manō there stands AKŌMANŌ, 'the evil mind'; against Asha-vahishta, ANDRA or INDRA, evidently an old nature-god, the Vedic Indra, who in the new religion was banished to the company of devils. The adversary of Khshathra-varya is SARU, perhaps, 'the tyrant,' as an enemy of Spentā Ārmati, NĀOGHATYA is named, again a deity of nature of the pre-Zarathushtrian epoch. However, TAROMATI is also found, who is the type of 'arrogance.' To Harvatāt and Amertāt correspond TARU and ZARJA, possibly 'hunger' and 'thirst'.

Among the rest of the Daevas, AESHMA, the demon of 'sudden anger,' should be particularly named. His destructive agency is indicated by the very epithet *khrvi-dru*,² 'with a bloody weapon'. It is he who hurries men into rash and bloody deeds.

Along with him must be named ASTO-VIDHOTU, 'the crusher of the body.' He appears to be the demon who causes sudden and unforeseen death, availing himself for that purpose of the holy element of water and also of that of fire³. APAOSHA is the enemy of Tishtrya. He keeps back the rain and burns up, by the aridity and heat of summer, the vegetation of the earth. But he is defeated by Tishtrya after a hot combat, and now the refreshing and fertilizing rains pour down. Lastly, we may here notice BUSHYĀSTA, who seduces men in the morning to give themselves up to indolent sleep. His opponent is principally the vigorous Srausha and his faithful herald the domestic cock.

When we have briefly mentioned the PARIKAS and the JAHIS, about whom I have had occasion to express myself frequently in my 'History of Civilization',⁴ there remains only the terrible DRUJ NASUSH. She is the demon of decomposition. Immediately after death has taken place, she rushes in and takes possession of the body, which is thereby putrefied. Everything dead belongs to her and falls into her power, and whosoever therefore comes into contact with the dead has to submit to the ceremony of purification as prescribed by the Law.

It is hardly necessary for me to refer, in concluding this Introduction, to Spiegel's '*Eranische Alterthumskunde*,' in which the same subject has been treated. The section on the 'Religion of the Old Iranians' is a rich mine of information concerning that subject. That my exposition nevertheless

¹ Comp. Vd. X, 9.

³ Vd. V. 8

² Yt. XIX, 95; Vd. X, 23.

⁴ Vide § 16.

essentially differs from that of Spiegel, is owing to the special object which I had in view. It has not been my main purpose to treat the matter exhaustively ; my chief aim was rather to render the characteristic elements of the Avesta religion conspicuous. I wished to show how it occupies an independent and highly important position, through its entire tenor and through the process of intuition which manifests itself in it. I wished chiefly to prove how the purely ethical element preponderates, while everything besides, especially the activity of the world of divine beings in the phenomena of nature, falls into the background.

Finally, may I hope that I have succeeded in sketching a clear and correct picture of the faith which Zarathushtra created thousands of years ago, and which is still professed up to this day by the Parsees of India and Persia !

THE ETHNOGRAPHY

OF THE

AVESTA PEOPLE¹

CHAPTER I.

§ 1. THE ARIANS AND THEIR EXTENSION.

THE Avesta people, as we find them in the Sacred Texts, are pre-eminently a religious corporation. It is their attachment to the Mazdayasnian faith, or their hostile attitude towards it, which is the true criterion according to which all men are classified. To the priests, who composed these texts and whose ideas we may consider them to represent, the above was indeed the principal and cardinal question. He who did not accept the doctrine proclaimed by them, stood opposed to them as an enemy, as much perhaps as the members of foreign tribes with whom no relations were maintained. With the Irānians it was not the case, as it was with the Indians, that the whole nation adhered to *one* belief and *one* religion, prayed to the same deities, and offered sacrifice at the same altars. Nay more, the Irānian people were split up by the Zoroastrian Reform into two factions, which fought against each other with the greater enthusiasm, the closer had been the ties which had previously united them.

But whilst religion and religious unity appear in the foreground, the element of nationality is by no means insignificant. The Irānians did not regard themselves merely as members of the Mazdayasnān Community, who revered their God-sent prophet in Zarathushtra, and their highest God and Master in Ahura Mazda ; but they also felt that they belonged to *one* tribe and *one* nation, they recognized the ties of blood derived from their ancestors, their common descent, language and customs, and they called themselves accordingly by one common name, that of 'Arian.' This name probably indicates the nation as that composed of the Noble, the True, and the Pious, for they believed every virtue and every desirable and praiseworthy quality to be the peculiar heritage of their own tribe, whilst they undervalued the character of foreign peoples in the same proportion as they exalted their own². If, in accordance with another view, 'Arian,' like the German '*deutsch*,' denoted simply 'the man of one's own tribe,' the meaning of the name would in

¹ Translated by Dastur Dr. D. D. P. Sanjana from the German of Dr. Geiger bk. i, ch. 3, § 23.

² *Airya*=O. P. *airya* from root *ar*. The original signification is still often found in Skr. *arya*, 'true, devoted, and friendly to the gods' (Grassmann, *Wörterbuch*, s. v.), as well as in the counterpart to *airya*: N. P. *anēr*, 'prava indoles' (Vullers, *Lexicon*, s. v.). I must mention however that to the Av. *anairya* I give the meaning 'non-Arian' in all passages (also Vendidad I, 18).

that case be essentially weakened¹. Hence I adhere to the first explanation, which seems to correspond thoroughly with the spirit of the age and the self-conscious and exclusive character of the Irānians as also of the Vedic Indians.

As the legendary hero *Jāmāspa* beholds the army of the enemy advancing to battle, he implores the *female-yazata* Anāhita to bestow victory upon him as upon *all the other Arians*². A man of the name of Erkhsha 'the Bear' is called the best archer *among the Arians*.

'Thee Tishtrya we praise, the bright, radiant one, who goest as swiftly along the sea Voru-kasha as the arrow obeying the will of Heaven, which Erkhsha has discharged, who shootest swift arrows, who shootest the swiftest arrows amongst the Arians³.'

The territories inhabited by the tribes of the Avesta people are spoken of as 'the Arian Lands' or as the 'Homestead of the Arians⁴.' The consciousness of unity of race and of equality of blood displays itself most clearly in the statement that from *Gaya-martan*, the first man according to Irānian belief (in the *Shāh-nāmah* of Firdusi he is the first of the legendary kings under the name of Gayomard), Ahura Mazda created 'the race of all Arian regions, the seed of all Arian lands⁵.' The Avesta itself, as we know, mentions *Aryana-vaeja* (in which name that of the people is included) as the original seat and primitive home of the Irānians. With this name corresponds Strabo's 'Ariana,' which embraces the Eastern provinces, that is the primitive abode of the Irānian race, as well as the modern 'Irān,' which name is employed to the present day as the official designation of the whole kingdom of Persia. Herodotus also testifies to the antiquity of the name 'Arian.' He informs us that the Medes in earlier ages were universally named 'Arians⁶,' a statement which may probably be taken in a somewhat wider sense than would appear from the author's own words to be intended; and the name may thus be applicable not merely to that single tribe, but generally to all the inhabitants of the Irānian highlands.

In the title 'Arian' is implied, according to our ideas, something distinguishing and honourable, a fact which explains its frequent occurrence in proper names. This might be adduced as a powerful argument in favour of the correctness of my own view; for if 'Arya' only meant 'fellow-countrymen,'

¹ Roth, in the Petersburg *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s. v. *arya*; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 100.

² Yasht V, 69; *Yathavispe anyē-aire*.

³ Yt. VIII, 6 and 37. I treat *Erkhsha* as a proper name = Ved. *ṛksha*, Rv. VIII, 68, 15. Cf. also Goldner and Noeldeke, *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxxv, p. 445.

⁴ *Airyāō daghāvō*, Yt. VIII, 9 and 50; X, 4, &c.; *airyō shayana*, Yt. X, 13.

⁵ Yt. XIII, 87.

⁶ Herodotus VII, 62.

it is difficult to believe that it would have been found suitable for the formation of personal names. A whole series of such names as Ariobarzanes, Ariomardos, &c., is transmitted to us by Greek and Latin authors¹.

The Avesta nations are not actually styled 'Arians' in the oldest fragments of the Avesta, the Gāthās; but this absence may be explained from the character of the epoch of civilization represented by these hymns,—a period of the most embittered religious and economic struggles, in which the national element was entirely secondary. The reason cannot have been that the name was unknown; for it is primeval and older than the Irānian nation itself, which has received it from earlier ages. The Indians likewise speak of themselves in the songs of the Rig-veda as the 'Ārya²,' and distinguish themselves as such from the dark-skinned aborigines of the land of the Indus and its five tributaries. During the contest with these—the enemy or *Dāsa*—the Arians, gradually advancing towards the East, occupy the plains of the Panjāb. It may be assumed, therefore, that even at the period when Indians and Irānians constituted a single undivided nation and when these two distinct tribes had not yet been formed, the name 'Arian' had been invented and was in use as a regular designation of the entire people. Furthermore, there are distinct traces extant which give it a still higher and more venerable antiquity. After the division of the Arian people had taken place, both the tribes, the Indian as well as the Irānian, retained their customary appellation and applied it in their usual manner.

It may not be without interest at this point to take a brief survey of the present distribution of the Arian race in the provinces of Central Asia, on the banks of the Oxus and the Jaxartes, as well as in Afghanistan. It is here represented by that highly interesting class of people, the Tājiks, who have their abode in the midst of the Afghāns, Beluchees, and Uzbecks, as a tribe foreign to but tolerated by them and living in peaceful intercourse with them. They form the really settled part of the population, living by commerce, industry, and agriculture, and are therefore very often called *dihkāns* 'peasants' or *dihvars* 'villagers.' Similarly in the Uzbekian principalities the name *Sart* denotes the settled portion of the people, the inhabitants of towns and villages, as opposed to the nomadic Kirghis; while the Tājiks are understood to belong to the Arian race as opposed to the Turks or Tatars. Shaw on this point

¹ Cf. Keiper, *Die Perser des Aeschylos*, p. 69.

² Ludwig, *Die Manthraliteratur und das alte Indien, als Einleitung zur Uebersetzung des Rig-veda* (Rv. vol. iii) 207; Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 100. In Indian the word *ārya* derived from the original *arya* serves as a name of the people; however, cf. Böhlingk and Roth, *Sanskritwörterbuch* s. v. *arya*, as well as its compounds *aryajārā* 'beloved of an Arian' and *aryapatnī*, 'wife of an Arian.'

observe: 'Among these various tribes there are two great cross divisions. The first is the division of Turk and Tājik, or of Tartar and of Arian blood. The other classification is that of nomads and settled people, Kirghiz and Sarts.' Hence it follows that by nature, and in all their habits of life, as well as in the development of the civilization of particular tribes, the Sarts are mostly composed of Tājiks, while the nomads are invariably Tatars. Thus it is explained why the Sart and the Tājik are very often regarded as identical. But this is quite incorrect; 'for all the Khōkandis . . . agreed in affirming that Sart is merely a word used by the Kirghiz to denote all who do not lead a nomad existence like themselves, whether they be Tajiks or Uzbecks.' In a word, the name Sart has a purely historical import, while that of Tājik is rather ethnological.

Concerning the spread of the Tājiks in Afghānistān, I need not speak at length after what has been communicated to us regarding them by Elphinstone, and subsequently by Spiegel². They are most numerous in the vicinity of the towns: they form the chief part of the population of Kābul, Kandahār, Herāt, and Balkh, while they are completely unknown amongst the inhabitants of the wilder portions of the land. In several districts, especially in Kohistān, that is to say, not far from the capital of Afghānistān, they have preserved their independence. Here indeed they do not exhibit any trace of the submissive and cringing disposition which they so readily assume in their intercourse with a ruling caste. They are on the contrary warlike and eager for the fray, and live in constant feuds amongst themselves. Another branch of the Tājiks inhabits the Lōgar valley, and a third, that of the Fūrmūlis, is in possession of Urghun, to which we look for the old *Urva* of the Avesta. In Seistān, where they are called *dihkāns*, they likewise form the more ancient portion of the inhabitants collectively, and are similarly spread over the whole of Baloochistān, distinguished by their fixed mode of life and by the fact that they speak the Persian language.

In the country of the Amu and the Sir the Tājiks are far more important. Ujfalvy, to whom we are indebted for detailed and authentic historical accounts of them, correctly points out that three classes must be distinguished: firstly the native Irānians, who naturally claim our fullest consideration; next, the Persian

¹ *Reise*, p. 21. Cf. Lerch (*Russische Revue*, vol. i, 1872, p. 30 seq.), who derives the name Sart from O. Ir. *khshathra* (by metathesis *khsharta*=N.P. *shahar*, 'city') and examines the history of the expression with his usual thoroughness. Its most ancient application is said to have been in the name of the 'Ιξ-ῥῆραι' whom Ptolemy mentions as living in the lowlands of the Sir (the Silis of the younger Pliny), where formerly more numerous towns, villages, and hamlets existed than at the present day. In Sogdiana the name Sart is obsolete, while it occurs again in Khiva. Sultān Baber denotes by it the populations of several towns and districts in Ferghānā.

² Spiegel, *Iranisch Alterthumskunde*, vol. i, p. 340 seq.

colonists ; and, lastly, the descendants of Persian slaves.¹ The indigenous Tājiks as a general rule have brown hair and beards, but there are also found individuals with fair or red hair. Khanikoff² describes them as tall people with black hair and beards. Their eyes are large and dark, the nose well formed, the mouth rather large, the forehead broader, and the whole structure of the body somewhat heavier than in the case of the Western Persians. Shaw³, to whom we are indebted for most of our knowledge respecting the inhabitants of the Pāmīr, describes the Tājiks as follows :—

‘The Tajiks are a very handsome race with high foreheads, full expressive eyes shaded by dark eyelashes, thin delicately-formed noses, short upper lips and rosy complexions. Their beards are generally very large and full, and often of a brown and even sometimes of a reddish tinge. They differ from the high-caste men of Northern India only, in being more stoutly and strongly built, and in having fuller faces.

‘Their kinsmen, the men of Badakshan, bear, even a closer resemblance to the Northern Indian The Wākhanis partake of these characteristics, having also some of them light hazel-coloured eyes, as have also the Sirikulis whom I saw at Kāshghar. But the rough life they lead in their highland valleys had given a certain harshness of feature as well as an asperity of character, which contrasts with the good temper of their neighbours the Kirghiz.’

Ujfalvy further points out that ‘the Tājiks of the mountains’ are of a more independent and noble character than the inhabitants of the plains. This, as well as their exterior and the primitive customs which are preserved amongst them, permits us to recognize in them the genuine descendants of the old Mazdayasnān. As everywhere else, so also in Central Asia, the secluded and inaccessible character of the high mountainous districts helped to preserve and perpetuate the peculiar characteristics of their inhabitants.

The Tājiks of the mountains are collectively called by the name of Galcha⁴. I do not think we can with justice accept any fundamental distinction between the Galchas and the Tājiks of the plains⁵. All the differences that exist between them, whether extrinsic or intrinsic, may be explained by the fact that the former, being isolated in their mountains and high valleys, preserve the type of the Arian race in a purer and less impaired state, while the latter

¹ Ujfalvy, *Expéd. scient.* vol. ii, pp. 33-34 ; Khanikoff, *Mémoire sur l'ethnographie de a Perse*, p. 92.

² *Mém. sur l'ethnogr.*, p. 103 ; comp. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, pp. 339-340.

³ *Reise*, pp. 22-23.

⁴ The name probably means ‘mountaineer,’ if the derivation of Tomaschek (*Pamir-dialekte*) from Pers. *ghar*, O. Ir. *gairi*, is correct. Ujfalvy : ‘le Galcha qu’on a appelé jusqu’à présent aussi Tadjik des montagnes’ (‘the Galcha who was called also up to now the Tajik of the mountains’).

⁵ Cf. Van den Gheyn in the *Bulletin de l'Athéné Oriental*, 1881, pp. 221-223.

through their intermixture with Tatarian elements, have lost much of the purity of their blood.

The Galchas are described as individually handsome, with brown, and occasionally red or even light flaxen hair; while the *brachycephalous* skull-formation and considerable skull-capacity form a striking peculiarity, which but seldom appears prominently in the pure Tājiks.¹ Galchas are found in the valleys of the mountains surrounding Ferghāna; they dwell in the country round the sources of the Zerafshān, particularly in the valley of Yaghnōb and along the Oxus as far up as its sources in the Pamir; and even in the eastern parts of the plateau of Pamir itself, that is to say, beyond the Neza-tash ridge we meet with them in the district of Siri-kul. Not less interesting are the natives of the southern declivity of the Hindūkush, in Chitrāl and Kafirstān but they appear to belong mostly to the Indian race.

The language of the Galchas, which has been of late the object of careful investigation², is divided into several dialects, which have a particularly close connection with the old Eastern Irānian, and thus with the language of the Avesta. If it shows an admixture of Indian words, the reason for this probably lies only in their primitive condition, in consequence of which they still suggest to us more of an original affinity with the Indian than with Modern Persian.

Of the Pamir dialects the Mungī or Mindshāni is the most important. It is spoken in Mungān, the neighbourhood of Karān, Paryān, Shangān, and in the still unknown valleys on the frontiers of Kāfiristān, and is distinguished by a peculiar resemblance to the Avesta language. In the valley of the Panja, according to the different districts, the Wākhi, the Ishkāshamī, and Shigni are spoken. Besides this, the Sanglichī, the dialect of Sanglich (between Mungān and Ishkāshim), is worthy of mention, as well as the Yaghnōbī, the language of the Galchas in the mountains near the upper Zerafshān. I must not pass over the report of Mushketoff³ upon the Galchas dwelling in the vicinity of the glaciers of Zerafshān. He regards them as the direct descendants of the ancient Persians. Their civilization is a highly primitive one. They do not occupy themselves with agriculture; their houses and chattels are made of stone, the former without lime or cement. Their sole domestic animal is the *Ishak*, a kind of wild ass, which they use for carrying burdens.

We have just spoken of members of the Irānian stock, who have remained in a very low stage of civilization. Of the other Galchas this cannot be asserted

¹ Tomaschek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 5 seq.

² Tomaschek, in his *Zentralasiatische Studien*, vol. ii, has worked up the materials collected by Shaw ('On the Ghalcha Languages,' 'Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' vol. xlv, 1876, pp. 139-278; xlv, 1877, pp. 97-126). He holds the inhabitants of the Pamir to be the descendants of the Saks, and 'such a linguistic research is to serve above all as a valid support to the following historical proof that those Saks were a purely Irānian tribe, which had preserved the old Irānian mode of life and the genuine Irānian type in greater purity than the Medo-Persians, who were strongly influenced in every way by the Semites.'

³ 'Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society,' vol. ii, 1880, pp. 765-766.

in the same degree. I incline to believe that we may recognize in them the descendants of the Zoroastrians. The Avesta expressly described the primitive home of the Irānian people, the most holy *Aryana-vaija*, as being situated in the mountainous countries drained by the Sir, the Zerafshān, and the Amu. Into these almost inaccessible valleys the faithful adherents of the Mazda religion may have retired further and further before the attacks of the Tatars and the Arabs. There they still cherished for a long time the ancient and venerable *cultus* which they had inherited from their ancestors. Many antiquated customs, preserved to the present day, point to this conclusion. For instance, Wood¹ relates that he observed among the inhabitants of Badakhshān and Wakhān a peculiar disinclination to blow out a light. This is in conformity with the ideas and usages of the Zoroastrians, and, more important still, of the Zoroastrians alone. Fire was notoriously regarded by them as the most sacred element, which must be preserved as much as possible from any kind of profanation. Even the breath of man or his spittle is sufficient to desecrate it. Therefore even the priest before the fire-altar must perform his ceremonies and recite his prayers with his mouth covered. I can allude but briefly to the peculiar customs of the Kāfirs: their practice of exposing the dead and also their peculiar treatment of women after delivery and during their courses, which correspond so closely to the similar precepts of the Avesta that we can scarcely admit the possibility of a merely accidental resemblance².

Finally, our theory is corroborated by native legends. In Shignān a tradition³ exists that the inhabitants of that land were, so late as from 500 to 700 years ago, *Zardushiti*, adherents of the Mazda religion, and that only then were they converted to Islām by Mahomedan emissaries from the neighbouring western provinces. Certain buildings in the valley of the Oxus are dedicated to the *Ātashparastagān*, or 'fire-worshippers⁴.' Even if this statement be not altogether accurate, it still proves that people have preserved in the Galcha provinces down to the present day the remembrance of their former connection with the old national religion.

If at a future time the veil which still hangs over the territories of the Oxus, *viz.* Shignan, Roshān, and Darwaz, should be lifted by a courageous traveller and inquirer, we may expect to receive new and abundant information concerning the highly important questions of Central Asiatic Ethnography and Irānian Antiquity.

§ 2. THE ADVERSARIES OF THE AVESTA PEOPLE.

THE life of the Avesta people was by no means one of peacefulness and tranquillity. The Gāthās themselves present a picture of continual combats

¹ 'Journey,' pp. 177, 218; comp. therewith Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 339.

² Masson, 'Narrative of Various Journeys in Baloochistan, Afghānistān, and the Panjāb,' vol. i, p. 224 seq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i. p. 397.

³ Gordon, 'Pāmīr,' p. 141.

⁴ Wood, 'Journey,' p. 218.

and feuds, and show us how the existence of the newly-founded community of the Mazdayasnān, remained for a long time most precarious and uncertain. By degrees, however, all opposition seems to have broken down, the Mazda religion thrived and increased, the number of its adherents grew larger from year to year, and in the more recent part of the Avesta they appear no longer as a maligned and persecuted people, but as victors and rulers.

This brings us to a cardinal question in the history of the civilization of the Avesta people, a question which we may briefly state as follows. Are we to concede that the Irānians, at the time of their immigration into the settlements described in the Avesta, did not there meet with an aboriginal people not akin to them? Do we learn from the Avesta itself anything of conflict with tribes of non-Arian race? Or do all the descriptions of hostile surprises and warlike undertakings, which occur in the Avesta, refer solely to the feuds carried on amongst the Irānians themselves; and are consequently the names of nations (to be hereafter enumerated) handed down to us in the Avesta to be all explained as designations of particular tribes (and their subdivisions) of the Irānian people?

As regards the first part of this question, it is evident that in the Avesta a very marked social and religious opposition is exhibited from the beginning a contrast between the settled population and the nomads, between the adherents of the Zoroastrian doctrine and their enemies. And from that time forward it is unquestionable that this opposition is of paramount importance, and is most strongly emphasized by the authors of the Avesta. However, I believe that all the circumstances bearing on this point have not yet been explained. As the inhabitants of Turkistān are divided according to descent into Turks and Tājiks, into members of the Arian and Tatarian races, and according to occupation into Sarts and Kirghiz; so, side by side with the economic separation of the population into wandering herdsmen and agricultural settlers, there exists also a national schism which affords us proof of the existence of a non-Arian element in old Irān. It is true, the national opposition, so far as it seems to be indicated in the Avesta, does not belong to the present, but rather to the past—at least more frequent mention is made of the battles fought with the race foreign and hostile to the Arians in the legendary stories than in the form of genuine historical narrative. However, all this none the less tends to prove the existence of a non-Arian aboriginal people.

The religious and economical schisms more or less coincide, as we shall see presently. The Zoroastrian doctrine thrives among the settled population, who first accept it, while the nomadic tribes mostly decline to submit to its binding and restraining laws. The Avesta on this account invariably extols the settled life of the peasant and the careful tending of cattle, and recognizes a religious merit in the cultivation of the soil and in the reclaiming of land still lying waste, as also in the gradual promotion of civilization.

But the social contrast can be as little mistaken for the national one in old Irān, as it can in the present age in the principalities near the Sir and the Amu. It is probable, from internal evidence, that the non-Arians were mostly nomads; but there is no doubt that a considerable part of the old Irānian nation also followed the same roving manner of life. They had as yet by no means universally taken to agriculture and permanent settlements.

I begin with the Gāthās, the only part of the Avesta the contents of which are exclusively devoted to contemporary events and the description of existing circumstances. Here the contrast is manifestly the economic and religious one. I shall refer to this more in detail, when, in the economic portion of my work, I have to speak of the mutual relations of agriculture and cattlebreeding, as well as of the contrast between the nomadic and the settled populations.

On the one side stand the husbandmen, the pious, the faithful, truly devoted to Ahura Mazda and the Good Doctrine, who distinguish themselves particularly by the care which they bestow upon the sacred cow. On the other side we behold the impious, who do not plough the field, and who cause injury and harm to the cow: these are the nomads, who have no knowledge of the systematic rearing of cattle, the unbelievers who do not accept Zarathushtra's doctrine. That these too were Irānians is proved by the mere fact that the prophet argues with them, propounds his doctrine to them, and calls upon them to decide in its favour. This at least presupposes a community of language and a certain measure of relationship which we could not admit as existing between Arians and non-Arians. We have only to remember the sublime passage in which Zarathushtra, or one of his first adherents and followers, preaches the new faith (evidently in the midst of a large gathering of peasants), beginning with the words—

‘I will announce it: Now hear and understand,
Ye who have come from near and from far!¹’

Between the believers and the unbelievers, the husbandmen and the nomads, bloody conflicts ensued:

‘He shall not disturb our prayers,
Who said how one beholds in the worst manner (*or profanely*)
The cow and the sun with one's eyes;
Who bestows gifts upon the wicked,
But causes the pasture-grounds to lie waste,
And hurls his weapons against the pious!²’

The prophet even summons his adherents openly to the fight:

‘None of you shall listen to the words
And precepts of the wicked;
For into his house and into his village,

¹ Yasna XLV, 1.

² Ys. XXXII, 10.

Into his estate and his country
Will he bring grief and death.
Therefore slay them with weapons!'

The separation of the people into believers and unbelievers begins in the Gāthās, and continues throughout the whole of the Avesta. It is highly characteristic of the tone of the Avesta, and the language possesses a complete series of expressions whereby the adherents of the Zoroastrian religion and their opponents are designated². From the wicked, who are ignominiously compared even with noxious and loathsome animals³, originated every kind of evil, viz., hatred, enmity, and discord⁴; the faithful, on the contrary, distinguish themselves by their pious and holy spirit and their humble devotion towards Ahura Mazda⁵. The constantly recurring prayers of the Avesta, therefore, are especially those which call down blessings and happiness upon the faithful, and misery and misfortune upon the wicked.

'According to desire, power over all good that originates from piety is given to the pious; but no power is given to the wicked! Master of his wishes be the pious, impotent in his wishes be the wicked! Joy and prosperity do I wish for the world of the pious, but distress and adversity do I wish for the entire world of the wicked⁶.'

The religious and the economic schism in the population of old Irān is thus beyond question illustrated clearly enough. It is undoubtedly far more difficult to prove the existence of a race-opposition between the Arians and the non-Arians.

The plains near the Caspian and Aral Seas, as also those along the northern shores of the Black Sea, were, even in the most ancient days, inhabited by a large number of wandering tribes, which are usually classed under the general appellation of 'Scythians' by the Greeks. They may be considered as consisting chiefly of the aboriginal population of Irān. If they were of Tatarian descent, like the present inhabitants of the steppes—and certain analogies in their mode of life and customs with those of the present Turkomans and Kirghiz

¹ Ys. XXXI, 18.

² The most important amongst them are: *Ashu* or *ushavan* (Skr. *ṛtāvan*), 'pious righteous'; *anashavan*, *draot* (in the Gāthā dialect *dregvat*, where *g* strengthens *v*, as in *hvōgva*, identical with *hvōva* of the common dialect), 'impious, unrighteous'; *hudaēna*, 'adhering to the good doctrine'; *duzhdaēna*; *Mazdayasna* 'Mazda worshipper'; *da:vayasna*, 'demon-worshipper'; *dahma*, 'pious'; *adahma*. Fellow-believers are called *hāmō-daēna* or *hva-daēna*, the believers in other faiths *anyō-varena* or *anyō-tkaēsha*.

³ Hence *khrafstra-mashya*, 'men like *khrafstras*.'

⁴ *Aēnağh* 'hatred,' proceeds from the wicked (Ys. XXXII, 6-8); the wicked are designated as *tbishvañtō*, 'malignant, hostile' (Ys. XXVIII, 7); their resistance is called *paiti-rema*, *ašhma* (Ys. XLIV, 20; XLVIII, 7; XLIX, 4, &c.).

⁵ Hence the abstract terms *asha*, *vohu-manō*, as well as *ārmaiti* (in the Gāthās = *āramaiti*), are frequently used as concrete for 'the pious, righteous'; Ys. XXXIII, 3; XXXIV, 2 and 3; XLVI, 16, &c.

⁶ Ys. VIII, 5, 6, 8.

cannot but be recognized—the diversity of race would be thereby established. However, it is almost agreed that the Scythians were of Arian descent, as appears particularly from the proper names transmitted to us through the medium of Greek writers. The southern tribes appear to have belonged to the Irānian, the northern perhaps to the Slavonic branch of the Indo-Germanic family¹. Concerning the Scythian nation of the Saks, which dwelt in the mountainous countries near the upper banks of the Amu-daryā, Tomaschek² specially undertakes to adduce proofs that it was a genuine Irānian tribe, and that it has preserved the characteristics of the Irānian nation in a purer and more genuine form than perhaps the Persians or the Medes. Here again then we have no national contrast, but merely another instance of that economical separation of the Irānian people into nomads and settled colonists, which is indicated by the most ancient fragments of the Avesta. The Scythians represented only those tribes which still wandered over the steppes as migratory herdsmen; whilst the Sogdians, Persians, Medes, Bactrians, Arians were those who had taken to the cultivation of the soil and to permanent dwellings. But if the Scythians of ancient times exhibit many striking points of resemblance in customs and ways of life to the modern Tatarian inhabitants of the steppes; if they, like the latter, distinguished themselves as bold riders delighted in continual battles and feuds, drank mares' milk as their favourite beverage, and lived in the most astonishing and repulsive, uncleanliness,—all this must have been on account of the identity of external circumstances in the nature of the soil and climate, whereby both have been influenced, and the same results were brought about at different times and among different nations.

I do not wish to deny the Irānian, or at all events Arian, nationality of a large portion of the Scythian tribes, least of all that of the Saks³, but I would remark that the name 'Scythian' is used rather vaguely by Greek writers. It strikes me that the name had more of an economic import, and comprehended all the nomadic nations of the Eastern European and the Central Asiatic lowlands, without taking into consideration whether any differences of blood and language existed. In short, the notion contained in the name 'Scythians' is co-extensive with the vague and general expression 'Tūrānians,' much in favour with modern writers or perhaps with the term 'Kirghiz' in the case of modern Turkistān. If, therefore, it can be proved with certainty of a part of the Scythians, that they belonged to the Arian race and spoke an Arian

¹ Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. ii, p. 430 seq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. ii, p. 333 et seq.

² *Pamirdialekte*, p. 4.

³ According to Grigorjeff ('On the Scythian Tribe of the Saks'), as well as according to Cuno ('Inquiries in the Region of Ancient Ethnography, part i, 'The Scyths'), the Saks are a Slavonic people; while in other quarters this view is disputed (cf. *Russische Revue*, vol. i, pp. 103-105).

language, it does not follow that there were not also tribes of a foreign race, perhaps Tatars, amongst the Scythians and reckoned as belonging to them¹.

This is merely by the way. As we are here dealing only with a possibility, I shall omit further mention of the Scythians, and shall attempt to discover whether no other traces of a non-Arian aboriginal population may be discovered. And such traces are undoubtedly to be found. The best Assyriologists are agreed that the Semites, on their immigration into the plains of the Euphrates and the Tigris, found a people foreign to them, with a culture, language, and writing of their own. From the blending of the two tribes, the Sumir and the Akkad, the aborigines and immigrating Kushites or Semites, arose the Chaldaean people. This gradual intermingling may have taken place only after fierce struggles and contests, but no tradition reaches back to those warlike ages of the past. Even in the oldest monuments we find Sumir and Akkad already forming one nation. The language of the Sumir became gradually extinct, and only survived as a sacred dialect still preserved in temples and schools. But the writing invented by the aborigines, viz. the cuneiform character, was now accepted as the predominant and only current language of the Semites; it was adapted to the wants of the Kushite dialect, and served thenceforth for their writing as it had done before for that of the Sumerian dialect. Every symbol now corresponded to a new sound, without however losing its old signification. The symbol which, in the Sumerian language, meant the sun and the day, still retained its Sumerian phonetic value in *ut*, *ul*, *par* and *para*; it may however be also read *shamash* or *yum*, which are the Semitic words for 'sun' and 'day.' Thus the writing of the Chaldaean cuneiform characters of itself reveals to us the striking intermixture of two dissimilar elements, pervading in a similar way the entire civilized life of the tribes of the Mesopotamian lowland².

It is therefore clear that we must assume the existence of an aboriginal population of foreign race before the appearance in the East of the Semites, and even before that of the Arians. That it did not confine itself to the districts round the Euphrates and the Tigris, but that it spread likewise over the entire plateau of Irān, is to be accepted as pretty certain. Whether that original population was a Tatarian one, cannot indeed be proved absolutely, but it is not improbable, if we consider the character of the Sumerian language. If, relying upon Chinese sources, we allow that the present Khānātes, Khiva, Bokhārā, and Khökand, as well as Eastern Turkistān were inhabited in the

¹ To my delight I here find myself in accord with Maspero, who asserts positively ('History of the Oriental Peoples in Antiquity,' p. 129): 'The Scythians, the oldest among mankind, belong at least partly to those tribes of the Tūrānian race, which even at the present day inhabit the north of Europe and Asia from the marshes of Finland to the banks of the Amur.'

² Cf. Maspero, "History," pp. 135, seq., 152; Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums* vol. i, p. 247 seq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 381 seq.

most ancient times by an Arian population, and that the Mongol-Tatar race, first occupied those districts in a comparatively recent period¹, I must declare myself altogether incompetent to decide this question. However, this does not seem to me to touch the root of the matter. If we speak of an aboriginal population of Western Asia, we are dealing with an epoch of time for which direct historical testimony cannot be demanded, and which indeed stands at the very dawn of history. If, then, the Tataric-Mongolian nations which now possess Central Asia found Arian tribes there before them, very likely the Arians in their turn met in their first immigration with a primitive population of Tatars, which naturally, at the time when the new Mongolian invasion began, had been absorbed long ago by the ruling classes.

I would moreover suggest that no more weight be attached to these details than I myself allow them. For in order to attain to a really definite judgment on this difficult and complicated question, one must have made the most extensive studies regarding very different countries. Only the *possibility* that, side by side with the Arian population of old Irān, an older non-Arian one existed, may be considered as assured. This brings me to the principal point of my argument : How does the Avesta bear upon this question ?

I shall later on adduce some indirect proofs, which seem to establish the existence of a primitive non-Arian race. That slavery existed in old Irān follows, as well as from other causes, from the fact that industry, in spite of the absence of a peculiar class of manufactures, had reached a degree of development by no means insignificant. The slaves may have been either captives taken in war from among the hostile Arian tribes, or, what is more probable descendants of the conquered aborigines who had been deprived of their lands, but were allowed to follow trades which to the conquerors appeared less honourable than agriculture. We shall find further on that, in the houses of the Mazdayasnān, daughters of unbelieving tribes lived as maid-servants and concubines, a practice denounced in the Avesta with such abhorrence, that we may conclude therefrom that, like the *dāsa-women* of the Rigveda, these must have been women belonging to the non-Arian tribes, against whom the priests of Mazda preached with such holy indignation.

But in the Avesta we have also proofs of the most direct kind. *Non-Arians* are often expressly named, and, twist and turn them as we will, these facts cannot be ignored, and we are thus actually compelled to assume the existence of non-Arian tribes in old Irān. The non-Arian countries are attacked by the Arians, they are destroyed through the glory of Zarathushtra². This is a clear allusion to the war of races which the Irānians, especially the pre-Zoroastrian Irānians, waged with their enemies, and in which they proved victorious. Of the province of *Varna* it is expressly said that it contained non-Arian

¹ Cf. *Russische Revue*, vol. ix, p. 328.

² Yt. XVIII. 2 (*anairyōdan'hāvō*) ; Yt. XIX, 68.

inhabitants.¹ Varna was, in my opinion, situated in the north-western parts of the country possessed by the Irānians, perhaps in the present district of Taberistān. And it may be hence conjectured that the non-Arian tribes gradually withdrew before the victorious Arians into the almost inaccessible mountains of the Alburz, in order to maintain there, for at least some time longer, their ancient independence.

This non-Arian tribe in Varna I hold to be identical with the 'wicked people of Varna,' frequently mentioned elsewhere in the Avesta, who stand in close relation to the 'demons of Māzenderān'. As Māzenderān is not very distant from Taberistān, there is good reason for believing in the connection, and we are also entitled to recognize in the demons mentioned above only foreign aborigines, the remnants of whom maintained themselves longest in the swampy forests on the narrow coast-district between the Caspian Sea and Alburz.

The war of races is moreover assigned by the Avesta to a very ancient period. The tradition respecting that period of bloody warfare is attached to the half-mythical figure of *Haushyangha*—Hōsheng in Firdūsī—one of the oldest princes of the line of the heroic kings of the Avesta and of the Shāhnāme :

'To the Ardvi-sura Anāhita did Haushyangha, the Paradhāta, sacrifice on the foot of the Hara, and he prayed to her : "Grant me this gift, O Ardvi-sura Anāhita, that I may become the supreme ruler over all demons and men, . . . and that I may slay two-thirds of the demons of Māzenderān and of the wicked people of Varna³."

As we know, Strabo also makes mention of a tribe of the Anariake, who according to him were settled on the coast of the Caspian Sea. Here we have the corrupt form of that name *Anarya* by which the Irānians of the Avesta

¹ Vd. I, 18 ; *anairyācha.dānhēush.aivishitāra*. I read *aivishitāra* instead of *aivishitāra* according to the Vendidad-sūde and the Pahlavi translation. The latter has *anārieh matān matam mānashnūh*. The word thus comes from the root *shi=khshi*, and we need only be surprised that the root-vowel is not increased before the suffix *tar*.

² *Varanya.drvañtō* and *māzaingya.dāva*. It has probably a similar sense, when it is said on *Urva* in the south-eastern boundaries of the territories of the Avesta people that 'evil inhabitants' dwelt there (*agha.aivishitāra*) Vd. I, 11 ; for its reading *vide* the preceding note ; (Pehl. *sharītar avarmānashnūh*). Here we must probably think not of non-Arian but of Indian tribes. Very interesting also is the expression 'malignant or hostile tribes' (*dānhēush.rīkhshāithyāo* and *rīkhshyēitish dānhāvō*. Yt. X, 27 and 78, as *anairyāo.dānhāvō*). The epithet is derived from the rt. *raksh=*Skr. *raksh*, and is thus akin to Skr. *rakshas*, which also serves in the Rīgveda as a designation for hostile tribes. The meaning 'demon' which is usually found in dictionaries is certainly only the secondary one, as in the case of *Dāsa* and *Dasyu*. Vide Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 109 seq. ; Ludwig, *Einleitung zur Uebersetzung des Rīgveda*, p. 211.

³ Yt. V, 22.

could scarcely have meant merely an individual tribe dwelling near the Caspian Sea, but rather all the tribes that belonged to a race foreign to their own.¹

If my view is correct, the aborigines of the land are frequently designated as *daiva*, demons. They were to the orthodox Irānians only the earthly image of the superhuman, wicked powers. In an analogous manner the two ideas which indicate demons and foes belonging to foreign tribes are continually intermingled in the Rig-veda, and we cannot always easily distinguish, in the different passages, which of the two designations is the correct one. If in the Avesta a distinction is made between *daiva* and *men*², we must naturally understand the former to mean superhuman monsters. It may be shown, however, that in the Rig-veda, too, the primitive population of the Panjāb, the people of the *Dāsa*, are frequently placed in direct opposition to the tribe of Manu, to the human race³. That the *daivas* of the Avesta may likewise be beings of flesh and blood we might be inclined to infer from the fact that even Mazdayasnān, when they grossly violate the commandments of Zarathushtra, degenerate into demons, and become like the rudest, most abject, and most profligate of men⁴. However, I may here assume a similar use to that of the German word *Teufel* (devil).

The struggle of the Arians with the *daivas*, the subjection of the primitive inhabitants of the Irānian highlands, naturally accompanied the first immigration of the Arian tribes in the earliest epoch of their history. Accordingly, the native legend assigns those events to the reign of King Yima, by whom also, as we shall see further on, the systematic breeding of cattle is said to have been introduced. His person at all events represents a very early and primitive stage of the civilization of the Irānian people. The Avesta makes him pray to Anāhita :

‘Grant me that I may snatch away from the demons both wealth and plenty, both fields and herds, both nourishment and splendour⁵.’

For the arable lands and pasture-grounds the course of the struggle is as follows. Yima tries to take by force from the *daivas* the districts suitable for thriving settlements in order to make them over to his own people. This was undoubtedly the beginning and the earliest phase of the war of races. The legend then goes on to ascribe to Zarathushtra the complete destruction of the *daivas*. Formerly they roved in human form about the earth, but after

¹ Strabo, pp. 507, 508 (here a city Anariaka is also mentioned), 514 near the Murders the Hyrcanians, the Cadusians and similar tribes. The *’Avzpiákzi* of Strabo would correspond closely enough to an Old Irānian *Anairiyaka*, a derivative from *anairya*.

² Ys. XXIX, 4 ; cf. also supra, Yt. V, 22, next the formations *daeva*, *mashya*, *yātu*, *pairika*, *kavi*, *karapan*, near them we also find *sātar* ‘the destroyer, the enemy,’ Ys IX, 18 ; Yt. I, 10 ; V, 13 &c.

³ Rv. II, 20, 7 ; V, 31, 7 ; VI, 21, 11, &c.

⁴ Vd. VII, 56, ‘ . . . he is a *daiva*, a worshipper of the *daivas*, one who holds intercourse with the *daivas*, one who adheres to the *daivas*.’ Cf. Vd. VIII, 31.

⁵ Yt. V, 26.

the advent of the prophet they disappeared and could only exercise their destructive influence as disembodied beings¹. Where the Irānian people thus gradually emerge from the dawn of legend into the brighter light of an historical age, the *daivas* and the battles with them are removed to a supernatural and superhuman region, and lapse into all-deforming myth. At the period of the foundation and of the flourishing estate of the Mazda-religion the dominion and independence of the non-Arian tribes are already broken down ; they have either disappeared from the soil and been destroyed by the Irānians, or they still subsist merely as the last survivors who have adapted themselves gradually to the laws and ideas of the victors, and who pursue a peaceful trade amidst the ruling classes of the Arians, without being any longer savagely persecuted by them but yet without enjoying equal rights.

We have already spoken of the *Māzanian daivas*. Whether their name bears any relation to that of the present province of Māzenderān cannot be proved with certainty ; however, it is not impossible. Māzenderān, on account of its extremely unwholesome climate and its marshy soil, which was certainly covered in olden times with impenetrable forests, may have remained free from the settlements of the Arians, and have served as a place of refuge to the conquered aborigines. In the legend of Firdūsī, also, Māzenderān is regarded as the dwelling-place of demons, as prominently appears from the narrative of the march of Kaikāus to that country².

It is with the *Māzanian daivas* that Haushyangha principally fights—the very hero of the Irānian legend who subdued the wicked people of Varna. He thus invokes the genius Druvāspa :

‘ Grant me, that I may overpower all *Māzanian daivas*, that, terrified, I may not give way through fear before the demons. Before us may all *daivas* in alarm give way against their will, terrified may they fly into darkness³’.

Together with the *daivas* are to be named the *drujus*, monsters which are also, as I believe, to be understood in very many cases as human beings, and indeed as race-enemies of the Arians. We read frequently in the *Gāthās* :

‘ For that reason do I ask Thee ; give me a correct reply, O Ahura : . . .
How can I deliver the monsters into the power of the pious
In order to slay them according to the commandments of Thy Doctrine,
In order to cause a mighty overthrow among the wicked ?
I will deliver them up, O Mazda, to Danger and Misery⁴’.

So also in the later Avesta, when the bullock, carried off by the nomads of the steppes, complains to Mithra that he has been led away into the abode of

¹ Ys. IX, 15, ‘Thou, O Zarathushtra, didst make* all demons,* who before roamed about the world in human forms,* conceal themselves in the earth.’

² Firdūsī, *Shāh-nāme*, ed. by Vullers, vol. i, p. 315 seq., Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 585 seq.

³ Yt. IX, 4 ; XVII, 25 ; cf. Vd. XVII, 9.

⁴ Ys. XLIV, 14.

monsters¹; or, when the 'monsters of Varna,' who may probably, however, be identical with the evil people of Varna, are expressly distinguished from the 'invisible monsters,' the wicked spirits².

Two results may be deduced from the above facts. The Avesta in no way contravenes the belief in a primitive race in Irân foreign to the Arians, but lends it a noteworthy confirmation. 'Non-Arian' tribes are expressly mentioned in the Zoroastrian documents. We furthermore arrive, through the Avesta, at the result to which modern interpretation of the Rig-veda has brought us. In many passages where mention is made apparently of monsters or demons, we have to deal, not with superhuman incidents, but with absolutely real and to a certain extent historical events. The same expression which designates the dark powers of Hell, the demoniacal enemies of the bright, beneficent deities of light, denotes also the enemies of mankind, and, indeed, especially those enemies with whom the Arians were united by none of the ties of blood, custom, religion, or language, and who might therefore, with some show of reason, be regarded by them as the embodiment of the power hostile to God—the non-Arian tribes whom they subdued in the earliest period of their immigration in the fierce war of races.

§ 3. *Character of the Adversaries of Avesta People.*

In particular cases it is naturally no easy matter to distinguish between those enemies of the Avesta people who, living as nomads, differed from them only in their economic status, and those who belonged to a foreign tribe. The following may be considered as a criterion at least occasionally applicable. As the war with the primitive race is as a rule laid in the legendary period, that is, in a past time remote from that of the Avesta, we are probably right in holding, where the Avesta speaks of existing circumstances, that the conflict is generally one between husbandmen and nomads. But where the events of an earlier epoch are described, there remains the possibility of allusion being made to a difference of race. At all events it is beyond question that in the Avesta national conflicts, as opposed to social ones, are only of secondary importance.

In this Section, therefore, I shall only mention in general those enemies who threatened the peace and security of the Avesta people, without considering whether they belonged to the Arian race or not.

These enemies were bodies of horsemen, who had their real abode and place of refuge in the desert. Mounted on swift horses, they broke suddenly into the settled well-cultivated districts of the Zoroastrians, and surprised their villages and hamlets. Whoever offered resistance was slain, the remainder, as well as the women and children, were carried off into captivity. The main object of these inroads, however, was simply to make booty of the herds of

¹ Ys. X, 86.

² *Varenya.dravaiti.druj, mainyava.druj*, Yt. I, 19.

cattle, which were driven off by the robbers into the oases of the steppes, where all pursuit was vain¹.

Such conditions of life vividly recall to mind those which existed down to very recent times on the north-eastern frontiers of Persia, and which have only very lately been gradually brought to an end through the extension of Russian dominion in Central Asia. As in ancient times the settled dwellings of the Avesta people were invaded by the nomadic tribes of the North, so in Khorāsān up to our own times the villages and estates of the Persians were liable to the inroads of the Turcomans. The object of the plundering excursions of the Turcomans is likewise to rob their more wealthy neighbours, and to carry off cattle and slaves. They owe their success more to their sudden and unexpected attacks, which cause the greatest panic and confusion among the Persians and cripple their power for resistance, than to their personal courage and resolution. The effects of such attacks are horrible, and travellers like Ferrier, Vámbéry, McGregor and others are able to describe dreadful scenes, which they have either heard of or witnessed with their own eyes.² The insecurity of life and property has here reached such a height, that the most flourishing and most fertile districts of Irān have become gradually depopulated and remain wholly uncultivated and useless. In many districts ruined villages are met with in close succession. The remains of waterworks and canals show that industry is declining. In some parts hardly a single family is to be found which has not had to lament the loss of one or more of its members, who have either perished during a raid or are pining in slavery among the Turcomans.

If however the Persians at the present day are everywhere at a disadvantage on the frontiers of Khorāsān, and do not even show themselves capable of making corresponding reprisals, the case must have been different in more ancient times. According to the Avesta, the princes of the Arian districts assembled and opened a regular campaign against their enemies, in order to exact a bloody vengeance for all their encroachments³. If we were to press this passage, we might even infer from it that the enemies referred to must have belonged to a non-Arian tribe.

An allusion to the marauding and plundering expeditions of the northern barbarians is contained in the following passage :—

‘What is, fifthly, most unpleasant to this earth?—When pious men,
O Spitama Zarathushtra, and women and children are driven into

¹ The dwellers near the banks of the Rangha, the Jaxartes, probably nomadic tribe of herdsmen, are expressly designated (Vd. I, 20) as *taozhya* (=N.P. *tūz*) ‘robber-like, rapacious;’ *taozhyācha.daghēush.aiwishitāra*.

² Comp. the collections by Marvin, ‘Merv,’ p. 177 seq.; on the system of attack and the mode of fighting of the Turcomans see particularly Ferrier, *Voyages*, vol. i, p. 162 seq.

³ Yt. X, 8,

captivity along the sandy, waterless way, and, complaining, raise their voice!¹

Here is evidently represented such a band of robbers on their way back to their sandy steppes from a successful raid. The captives are dragged away in fetters, and with tears and wailings they follow their cruel victors to a hard, life-long bondage. We can scarcely believe that two or three thousand years have intervened between the time when these descriptions were written and quite recent days, when the missionary Wolff, in his well-known 'Travels,' depicted scenes in every way similar, experienced and witnessed by himself in the same land².

As a designation of the nomads of the deserts who set out for plunder, the word *haena*, 'army' or 'hostile army,' is pretty often used in the Avesta. In this context the word corresponds perhaps to the modern *Al-amān*, the expression for the plundering expeditions of the Turcomans. It may be conceived that nothing was so much feared, nothing so much an emblem of horror and terror, as a surprise by the *haena* : —

'Whoever should give a wicked, impious enemy of the pious, the pressed juice *Hauma*, or of the consecrated food for the sacrificial festival meal, does no better work than if he led the *haena*, consisting of a thousand horse, against the villages of the Mazdayasnān, slew the men, and dragged away the herds of cattle into captivity³.'

The nature of the *haena* is clearly characterized in this passage, more especially by the descriptive epithet 'consisting of a thousand horse.' Elsewhere it is styled 'with broad lines of battle, malicious, surprising⁴.' The enemy is thus a force of cavalry, scouring the country in detached bands, not fighting man to man, but conquering through cunning surprises and sudden attacks, not by heroic valour. The *haena* also bears banners and standards;⁵

¹ Vd. III, 11. Observe the expression *varaithim.pantām.pāsneco ȝhem.hikrāo ȝhem* 'the dry and dusty way leading to captivity,' i.e. into the desert!

² Wolff, in Marvin, 'Merv,' p. 238. I cannot forbear quoting the description which the passage before us so strikingly recalls : 'Wolff was accompanied by Bokhara merchants who had bought at Sarakhs two Persian boys as slaves, whom they were going to bring to Bokhara to sell. The one was seven years of age, and the other nine. The Turcoman universally call the Persians Guzl-baash i.e., "Red-head." Wandering through the desert the two poor Guzl-baash slaves were singing in the morning, and during the day, and in the evening, in plaintive strains, the following words :

"The Al-annaan has taken us,
Poor, poor Guzl-baash !
And carry us, and carry us
In iron and chains, in iron and chains
To Oogantsh and Bokhārā."

Thus they proceeded through the desert, continually hearing that plaintive strain.

³ Vd. XVIII, 12 ; *hazaj rō-aspām.haenām*.

⁴ *Huṇayāoscha.perethu-ainikayāo.davāithyāo.patāithyāo*. Ys. IV, 18.

⁵ 'Before the wicked armies of the enemy, they bear the bloody banners (*khraem drafshem*),' Yt. X, 93 ; Ys. LVII, 25. Cf. *perethu-drafsha, uzgereptū-drafsha, khraem drafshem.barat*. Yt. XIII, 136.

and I may here remind the reader that the Turcomans also, I believe, carry field-ensigns, although their employment generally presupposes a certain amount of tactical knowledge and an organized mode of fighting.

On the other hand, it appears, somewhat incongruous to find the *haena* mentioned as using war-chariots¹. The nomads of the steppes certainly fought in that age, as they now do, on horseback only; the use of war-chariots points to more civilized nations. The writer therefore is either speaking of hostile armies in general, and not especially of the hordes of the deserts, or else he arbitrarily transfers the conditions and methods of his own people to other tribes.

The appearance of the enemy, as it was mostly a sudden surprise, naturally inspired terror and consternation². Only through divine assistance was it possible to master the dreaded and hated foe:

‘When Mithra drives against the terrible, hostile armies, against those so assembled for fighting in the battle of the country: Then does he fasten behind their backs the arms of those who have broken their engagements; then does he veil their sight and deafen their ears³.’

Naturally, it was the herds of the settlers that the nomads more especially hankered after. The main object of all the plundering incursions and surprises of the nomadic hordes was to gain booty, as was generally the case in all the wars of those remote ages. They found it more convenient to seize from their settled neighbours what they required, than to occupy themselves with the troublesome work of rearing cattle in a regular and systematic manner. If we consider what value the Avesta people attached to their herds, we can conceive why the loss of those dearest of possessions is lamented in the following strain:

‘On that blood-stained path into captivity wanders the cow, that goes upon hoofs, when she falls into the power of the breakers of covenants⁴.’

‘The cow that is driven away as booty, implores him (Mithra) for help, longing to return to her stalls: “When will the valiant one, driving us from behind, bring us back into our stall, O Mithra, the master of wide fields? When will he lead us to the paths that belong to the pious, who are dragged away into the abode of the demons⁵”’

¹ *Ratha, haņya. Yt. VIII, 56; XIV, 48.*

² *Vōighna*; comp. Skr. *vij*, part. *vigna*, ‘perplexed, confounded.’ Ys. LXVIII 13, *pairi.haenayāoscha, vōighnābyō* ‘before the terror which the *haena* calls forth.’ In Ys. LVII, 14 *vōighna* is akin to *aghāo.ithyejāo*, ‘evil, corruption;’ in Ys. VIII, 56; XIV, 48 near *haena, pāman, kapasti, haņya ratha, uzy:repta.drafsha*.

³ Yt. X, 48, *avi.haenayāo. khravishyeitish*. (Similarly Yt. XV, 49; XIX, 54).

⁴ Yt. X, 38. The ‘breakers of covenants’ *mithra.drujō* (as elsewhere occasionally *anashavan, dreat*, &c.) stand evidently for *haena* here, as in the passage (Yt. X, 48) translated above.

⁵ Yt. X, 86, *vide* Geldner, *Metrik*, § 104.

§ 4. *Names of Nations in the Avesta.*

WE have an interesting passage in the *Farvardin Yasht* which enumerates the most important nations in Irān. It runs as follows, omitting superfluous repetitions :

‘ We praise the *manes* of the pious men and of the pious women of the Arian countries, of the Tūrānian countries, of those of the Sarima, of those of the Sāni, and of those of the Dāhas¹.’

If we take this passage quite literally, we must at any rate assume that the Arians are here contrasted with the Tūrānians, the Sarima, the Sāni, and the Dāhas, and that the latter, therefore, do not belong to the Arian race. Here, however, I must first of all observe that so far as I am aware no further proof can be adduced from the Avesta for the non-Arian descent of the nations abovenamed.

I begin with the Tūrānians. At present we use this name ethnographically for the Tatarian nomadic tribes of Central Asia. But this application is arbitrary, and is in nowise confirmed by hints gathered from the Avesta. Nor is the practice justified by Firdūsī. Indeed, the name *Tūra* appears to have always been regarded by the Irānians, from the Avesta to the Book of Kings, as a collective idea which did not indicate any ethnographical division, but comprised the peoples of the steppes from the Caspian Sea to the Sir and beyond it. The remains of an aboriginal population of Tatars may thus indeed have formed part of them, just as may have been the case also with the Scyths of the Greek authors, but they must in all likelihood have been chiefly Arians.

The *Tūra* are mentioned in the *Gāthās* ; but, owing to the recognized difficulty of those texts, we must not attach too much importance to such an isolated passage. I believe it to mean that a family from that tribe, namely that of the *Fryāna*—the name is altogether Irānian—became converted to the Zoroastrian faith and adopted a settled life :

‘ When pious people in the family and amongst the kinsmen
Of the praiseworthy Tūrānian *Fryāna* arose,
Who increased zealously the settlements of the good :
Then settled with them together with the Spirit of the Good Mind
Ahura Mazda, and ruled over them, to their joy.²’

Elsewhere also the Avesta speaks of pious men amongst the Tūrānians as well as amongst the Dāhas³, and if this does not prove the non-Arian descent of those tribes to be an impossibility, it at least renders such a belief essentially more difficult.

As horsemen the *Tūra* are characterized by the epithet ‘with swift horses,’ but the passage in which it occurs is not perfectly clear.⁴ Against the ‘Tūrā-

¹ Yt. XIII, 143-144.

² Ys. XLVI, 12.

³ Yt. XIII, 113, 123, 143. The names *Arejāghat* and *Frārāzi*, which occur here, have a thoroughly Irānian sound.

⁴ *Asu-aspa*, Yt. XVII, 54.

nian countries' Tūsa, the Tūs of Firdūsi,¹ takes the field. But all the oppressions and injuries which the settlements of the Avesta people had to endure from their turbulent neighbours of the Caspian deserts are personified in the Tūrānian prince *Frangrasyan*, the Afrāsiāb of the *Shāh-nāme*, who, after protracted and desperate struggles, was finally overpowered by *Kavi Husrava*, Kai Khosrav, the king of the Irānians. Firdūsi naturally pictures these events in his accustomed manner as great wars in which innumerable heroes appeared on both sides in order to mutually test their strength and valour—thus altogether in the tone and style of a chivalrous epoch. The substance of these ancient legends he transforms with artistic hand according to the taste and conceptions of his own age.² In the Avesta the case is otherwise. It describes the battles with Frangrasyan and the Tūrānians more mythically, a proof that they had taken place in a period even then remote, and were at least almost at an end when the Avesta was composed. Thus it is the *yazata* Hauma himself, who delivers his enemy into the power of Husrava :

'To her, to the Druvāspa, did Hauma sacrifice . . . and beg of her this boon ! "Grant me . . . , that I may fetter the destructive Tūrānian Frangrasyan, and that I may bring him bound and in chains before the Kavi Husrava, so that Kavi Husrava may kill him behind the sea Chaichasta, the deep, wide-flowing"³.'

Further on, the battle with Frangrasyan is pictured in a mythico-symbolical way and is described as a struggle for the 'majesty' or the 'heavenly splendour'—the *hvarēno*. This is evidently the symbol and token of supreme power. When Frangrasyan fruitlessly endeavours to seize the *hvarēno*, we are probably to understand merely the tribes of the deserts that vainly strive with and endeavour to subdue the settled population.

That *Tūra*, however, has a tolerably general and comprehensive signification⁴ we gather from the simple fact that the name is interchangeable with similar collective appellations, or may appear in the place of names of individual tribes. Thus it is used as quite synonymous with *Dānu*, which evidently designates only the enemies of the Avesta people, be they Arians or non-Arians, in one word the 'barbarians' :

We adore the good, sublime, blissful Fravashis, the *manes*, who form many armies, carry hundreds of weapons, who bear banners—the

¹ *Tūrydo dānhāvō*. Yt. V, 54 ; comp. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, pp. 576, 620 seq.

² When Firdūsi describes the state of civilization among the Tūrānians in entirely the same terms as that of the Irānians ; when he makes them dwell in towns and castles with magnificent buildings, walls and towers ; when he represents the king as standing at the head of his people surrounded by his retainers—all this is manifestly a simple modernism, an anachronism frequent in the *Shāh-nāme*. According to Firdūsi, Irānians and Tūrānians are moreover cognate. They derive their descent from Frēdūn, whose three sons—Selm, Tur and Eraj—were the ancestors of the Western people, the Tūrānians and Irānians. Vide Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 546 seq.

³ Yt. IX, 17—18.

⁴ Justi (*Handbuch der Zendsprache*, s. v.) derives *tūra* from *taurv*, *tare*=Skr. *turv*, *tūrvati*.

radiant ones, who in mighty battles come rushing down, who, armed and steadfast, fight battles *against the Dānu*. 'Ye have overpowered the resistance of the *Tūrānian Dānu*; ye have subdued the enmity of the *Tūrānian Dānu* !'

In the course of this description the *Dānu* are styled 'having ten thousand (i.e. *innumerable*) princes.' This name shows that they were divided into a multitude of small sections and bands, each of which was ranged under one single chief unrestrained in his absolute power by any higher authority. This is a common feature of nomadic life, while settled tribes aspire to a concentration of authority by which the heads of the several individual sections of the people are in turn subject to one prince or king who stands above them; it is also particularly characteristic at the present day of the populations inhabiting the steppes of Turkistān.

From a historical point of view the word *Dānu* is of special interest, for this name is also found in the *Rig-veda*, as well as *Dānava*, another form of it. According to the dictionaries it is a designation of the demons, foes of the gods, who are opposed by Indra. But I believe that here, as with the name *Dāsa*—of which we shall speak further on—we must accept as the original meaning 'opponent, enemy'.² The united Indo-Irānians seem to have designated as *Dānu* the tribes not akin to themselves with whom they came in contact during their march from North to South. After the separation, the Irānians retained the name as a comprehensive appellation for all *Tūrānians*, that is, nomadic tribes on their northern frontiers; the Indians applied it chiefly to the non-Arian aborigines of the valley of the Indus and of the Panjāb, and extended it also to the enemies of the gods after the usual manner of ascribing earthly conditions to the supernatural world.³

For us the former, or historical meaning, so to speak, of *Dānu*, is more important than the mythological one. It is found in a song abounding in references to actual events:

'Wast thou not also, *Vritra-killer*,
O sublime one, quite filled with wrath,
When thou didst slay the *Dānu* (the enemies) 4?'

In another hymn, moreover, the subduing of the *Dānu* is placed on the same level with the overpowering of the *Dasyu*. That by the latter name the non-Arians of the Panjāb are meant probably no scholar will deny. I do

¹ Yt. XIII, 37-38. According to Yt. V, 73-74 (*yat.barūma. airi.vanyāo.dānarō. tūra.vyākhnā.*) the *Dānu* are vanquished by *Ashavazda* and *Thrita*. Here are also mentioned, as it seems, the names of *Dānu*-heroes—*Kara Asabana*, *Vara Asabana*, and *Duraekasta*—of which the last at all events has a true Irānian sound.

² *Dānu* is to be derived, just as *dāsa*, from rt. *dā*, 'to cut, to cut into pieces, to annihilate' (cf. Grassmann, *Worterbuch*, s. v.).

³ *Dānu* designates a demon, e.g., Rv. V, 32, 1, 4, 7, where it is used together with *Qushna* (vide Ludwig, *Einl.* 337), further I, 32, 9, and perhaps X, 120, 6.

⁴ Rv. IV, 30, 7.

not therefore see any reason why we should not recognize historical events in the entire strophe, instead of assuming a strange amalgamation of things human and superhuman.

‘Take, O strong one, the strength with which the enemies
Thou didst slay, the spider-brood of the Dānu ;
With which thou didst reveal the light to the Arian tribe ;
On the left sank the Dasyu tribe, O Indra!’

That *Tūra* must be understood as a collective name, we see further from the fact that the tribe of the *Hunu* is also spoken of as a Tūrānian one :

‘To Ardvi-sūra Anāhita did the armed Tūša, the warrior, sacrifice, sitting on the back of his horse, imploring strength for his teams, and health for himself, protection against his enemy, the defeat of his adversaries the entire subjection of his opponents, the wicked, hostile ones. And he prayed to her for this boon : “Grant me, O good, beneficent Ardvi-sūra Anāhita, that I may vanquish the armed *Hunu* in Vajśka near the defile Khshathrō-sauka, that lies high up in Kangha, the sublime holy one ; that I may kill them in the Tūrānian countries in hundreds and in thousands, in myriads and in numerable multitudes².”’

The above translation of the passage, according to which *Hunu* would be the name of a tribe, is at all events a simple and approximate one. But it is often disputed, as *hunu* is considered to be the Irānian equivalent for the Indian word *sūnu*, and is translated by ‘son’. I must admit that in the present case that sense does not quite satisfy me. Whose sons are thus vaguely referred to ? There is a genitive wanting, which is absolutely necessary to complete the sentence. If, on the contrary, my own view is correct, the passage contains a most remarkable hint well deserving of attention. It mentions a tribe of horse-men³, who are grouped with the Tūrānians, the tribes of the Northern steppes, and mentions as their dwelling-place the territories lying half-way up the Sir-daryā, where the existence of a Tatar tribe may be most easily and safely accounted for. Under such conditions one feels inclined to compare the Hunus of the Avesta with the later Hunns. In that case there would probably be no older testimony than the religious documents of the Zoroastrians to prove the existence of that energetic tribe, which later on exercised such a mighty influence on the history of mankind. But it is very dangerous to argue similarity of name, and it cannot be denied that weighty historical reasons are opposed to this hypothesis. The Hunns belong, in fact, to a much later epoch than the period of the composition of the Avesta, which moreover places the

¹ Rv. II, 11, 18, *dānum.aurnavabham*. With the last word comp. Grassmann *Wörterbuch*.

² Yt. V, 53-54, 57-58 : according to the obscure and difficult passage Yt. XIII, 100 ; *Kavi Vishtāspa* also was engaged in war with the Hunus (Yt. XIX, 86).

³ Hence *aurva.Hunavō*. Of interest is also Yt. XIX, 41, *Hunavō.yat.pathanya* (Skr. *patheshthā*, ‘being on the road, waylayers’) ‘the predatory Hunus.’ The context of the passage is indeed very difficult and obscure.

battles with the Hunns in the heroic age of the Avesta people. Even the white Hunns, who are mentioned by Haug, first appear in the last few centuries before the Christian era, when they drove the inhabitants of the Northern steppes towards the South¹. We need only assume that the Hunns, as a nomadic tribe, roved all about the steppes of Central Asia even in the remotest antiquity, and that they made themselves dreaded by isolated incursions long before they became notorious by their inroads on a large scale and by immigrating in large numbers amongst the tribes of Western Asia and of Europe. But under all circumstances I strongly maintain my view that the word *hunu* is the name of a tribe, whether or not that name be identical with that of the later Hunns. The interpretation of the text itself is not at all affected thereby.

As regards the *Sarima* and *Sāni* little can be positively asserted, since they are never named in the Avesta except in the passage cited above.² We must thus confine ourselves to conjectures, based upon the greater or less similarity to the sound of the name. By the *Sarima* tradition apparently denotes the peoples of the West. At least Firdūsī makes Selm, whose name may be identical with Sarima, a sovereign of the Western countries. According to the Book of Kings, the kingdom of Frēdūn was divided among his three sons, Selm, Tūr, and Eraj; the first received the West, Tūr the North, and the last Irān Proper³. As there is evidently a play upon the name here, we should do well not to overrate the historical value of this statement. The Sarima have been compared with the Sarmatians or with the Solymi⁴. As the former, according to the statements of Ptolemy and Strabo, must have dwelt on the plains near the lower course of the Don and the Volga⁵, we should at least to assume that they had wandered in course of time from East to West. For if they had already dwelt, in the period represented by the Avesta, where the Western writers look for them, the Avesta people would scarcely have been able to come in contact with them. In the same way I believe that the Solymi who had settled in Lycia⁶ were too remote. Personally I am inclined to consider the name Sarima to be a similar collective expression, like Tūra, for the different nomadic tribes of the North, and to give it as general a meaning as possible. I should translate it by 'archers',⁷ which meaning appears to be applicable from the fact that nomadic tribes are generally distinguished for their use of the bow, a peculiarity which is specially recorded of the Scyths.

¹ Comp. particularly Justi, *Handbuch*, s. v. *hunu*.

² *Sairima* indeed occurs in the *Vishtāsp-Yasht* (Yt. XXIV, 52), which is admitted to be thoroughly corrupt.

³ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 546.

⁴ Justi, *Hdb.* s. v.; Spiegel, *Avesta übersetzt*, vol. iii, p. 139, n. 1 and 2; Windischmann *Zoroastriische Studien*, pp. 229-230: cf. also de Harlez, *Av. tr.*, iii, 41, n. 2.

⁵ Kiepert, *Alte Geographie*, § 306; Forbiger, *Handbuch der alten Geographie*, vol. ii, p. 452 seq.

⁶ Forbiger, *H. a. G.* vol. II, p. 248.

⁷ From Skr. *çarya* or *çaryā*, 'arrow.'

As regards the *Sāni*, they have been identified with the Soanes on the south of the Caucasus. Justi reminds us of the city of Sān, which, according to Persian lexicographers, is supposed to be situated in Kābulistān or in Balkh. But no cogent proof can be brought forward in support of either view¹.

We now come to the *Dāha*. It is probable that the Avesta denotes by this name the Daai of the Greek historians and geographers. They are reckoned amongst the Scythian tribes that dwelt in Northern Hyrcania, east of the Caspian Sea. They extended as far as the Oxus and the Jaxartes, and Herodotus even speaks of the Daai as inhabiting the province of Persis. Consequently, they were widely spread and considerable in number, and, moreover, at the same time a 'warlike people, who served Darius Codomanus as cavalry, and Alexander and Antiochus as mounted archers².'

In the Rig-veda the name of *Dāha* is found under the equivalent Indian form *Dāsa*, and here we meet with linguistic coincidences similar to those we have already become acquainted with in the case of the *Dānu*. Scholars were formerly inclined to hold the fundamental meaning of *Dāsa* to be 'monster, demon hostile towards the gods,' and that meaning was adopted in the majority of passages. The aboriginal inhabitants of the Panjāb are said to be only secondarily designated *Dāsa*, because they opposed the immigrating Arians in a hostile manner. This view interpreters have more and more tended to abandon³. The correct process is quite the reverse. The natural course to follow is not that which leads from heaven or the ethereal regions down to the earth, or from the realm of the supernatural to that of the sensual, but the opposite one. Men took the circumstances of their own immediate surroundings, what they daily saw and experienced, for their starting-point, and transferred human conditions, representations, and ideas to spiritual and heavenly objects. By *Dāsa* in the Rig-veda is meant first of all an enemy, especially an enemy of the Arians, an enemy of foreign race, and this is certainly the sense in the great majority of passages. It is only in a secondary sense that it is used as a designation for the enemies of the benevolent gods—the demons whose destructive influence the fancy of mankind recognizes in scorching heat and drought in the raging storm-wind, in the burning and destructive lightning-flash, in the dark night of the thunder-clouds. As regards the use of the word

1 I derive *Sāni* from the rt. *sā*, which is also the origin of the word *sātar*, 'the enemy.' Thus the name generally bore the same meaning as *Tūra*..

2 Kiepert, *a. G.* § 61; Forbiger, *H. a. G.* ii, p. 570, note 13; Strabo, pp. 304, 511, 515; Herodotus, I. 125; Arrian III. 11, 28 ('the Daai living on the other side of the river Tanais—this river is mistaken for the Jaxartes,—the Daai on the banks of the Tanais,' cf. III, 30); V. 12; Curtius, viii. 3

3 Ludwig, *Einkl.* p. 207 seq.; Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 100 seq. The former has described the state of affairs quite clearly in the words: 'Wherever *Dāsa* and *Arya* stand opposed to each other, we may invariably consider the former to belong to the aboriginal inhabitants; where, on the contrary, demons alone should be understood, cannot in that case be easily settled. Only so much appears to us certain, that the latter are to be understood much more rarely than is done in the present system of interpretation.'

Dāsa in the Indo-Irānian period the same remarks are applicable as those above which concern the name *Dānu*. After the separation of the two Arian tribes the name appears to have been used so far differently by the Irānians, that it was evidently restricted to a special tribe, and no longer used as a designation for all the enemies of the Irānian people.

Names of tribes may be further contained in *Adhyu* and *Dadhika*. The latter have been excellently compared by Spiegel with the Dadikai of Herodotus¹. As they are constantly named together with those mentioned above², we may well regard the Adhyu as a tribe likewise, provided the comparison be correct. The Avesta does not furnish us with any more precise explanation; at most we may regard it as probable that they belonged to the Irānian nation, and that the Zoroastrian doctrine had found entrance among them. According to Herodotus, the tribe of the Dadikai seems to have taken part in the great campaign of Xerxes against the Greeks. It was closely united with that of the Gandars who were settled among the present Sulcinan mountains, and formed one assessment district with them³. Their place of abode is thus probably to be looked for in the neighbourhood, perhaps in the dominion of Ghazna, though in other cases also tribes living at a distance from each other belonged to the same district.

The *Vardhuka* and the *Hyauna* were enemies of the Avesta people, and were conquered by Kavi Vishtāspa. However, it is not easy to interpret the passage in which this fact is strikingly suggested⁴. Under the name of Hyauna are reckoned *Arjat-aspa*, as well as *Tānthravat*, 'the dark one,' and *Peshana*, 'the fighter'. These names are purely Irānian, and if their bearers neither assumed the titles themselves nor received them from the Avesta people, the Arian nationality of the Hyauna can no longer be doubted.

'The armed Kavi Vishtāspa subdued the *Tānthravat*, the adherent of the false doctrine, and the *Peshana*, the demon-worshipper, and the *Arjat-aspa* and all the other wicked *Hyauna* bent upon harm⁵.'

I am conscious that I am putting forward a mere hypothesis; but it seems to me deserving of examination. In the list of countries of the Vendidad (often mentioned) the counter-creations of the Evil Spirit are named, as we know, together with each district: in *Aryana-vaija*, extreme cold; in India, excessive heat; in *Haitumat*, the 'sins of *yātu*.' But at the same time it is also said with regard to several provinces, that in them unbelieving and hostile tribes were the scourge of the land; *Urva* has evil people, the country near

¹ E.A. vol. ii, pp. 380-381, note.

² *Aidhyu*, *Daidhika*, Ys. XXXIX, 2; Yt. XIII, 154; but in Yt. XIII, 74 *daidhika* is represented in a somewhat striking connection.

³ Herodotus, VII. 66; III. 91.

⁴ *Vardhaka*, *Hyaona*, Yt. IX, 30-31; XVII, 50-51 (here also *hyaunimām.dahyunām*, 'of the Hyaunian district'). Spiegel (E.A. vol. iii, p. 283 note) compares with the Hyauna the Chionites who lived on the western side of the Caspian Sea.

⁵ Yt. XIX, 87; comp. Yt. V. 109.

the *Rangha* predatory inhabitants, and *Varna* in the Alburz mountains a non-Arian population. This leads me to consider whether the names of tribes might not be directly conjectured from other expressions which are found in that connection, and which frequently offer a formidable *crux interpretum*.

In the case of *Moru* (Merv) *maredha* is denoted as the calamity created by Angra Manyu¹. Herein I recognize the name of the tribe of the Mardoi. These must have lived within the limits of *Moru* and must have harassed that district by pillaging expeditions. Their character is sufficiently indicated by their name; for *maredha* signifies 'murderer'².

The Mardoi or Amardoi—for even Strabo expressly declares that the two names are identical³—had, like the Daai, spread very widely and were found, according to Greek authorities, in the most diverse countries of Western Asia. We meet with Mardoi in Hyrcania, where they dwelt in the inaccessible mountain-passes of the Alburz, perhaps in the vicinity of Demāvend; and also in the mountains of Persis. Against both those tribes Alexander the Great fought; against the former he took the field from Zadrakarta the capital of Hyrcania, against the latter from Persepolis. There were Amardoi in Bactria and Scythia; they may also have dwelt in Margiana; Mardiyeni are mentioned as living in Sogdiana⁴. They were probably the mere remnants of a distinct tribe which formerly roved about the border of the habitable districts of Eastern Irān towards the deserts.

More interesting still is the name of the Derbikes, which I find again in the Old Irānian *Driwika*. The Driwika are regarded as a counter-creation in *Haraiva*⁵, which seems to be in complete harmony with the statements of Western writers, according to whom the Derbikes dwelt in the north of Margiana⁶. They may perhaps have occupied the territory between Mero and Sarakhsh. They are described as a nomadic people in so low a stage of civilization and with such coarse and strange manners and customs that they can hardly be considered Arians. 'They worship the Earth as their deity, sacrifice and use as food no female beasts, slaughter and eat (!) old men of over seventy years of age⁷; whilst they hang old women and then bury them.'

¹ It is said in Vd. I, 6; *āat.ahē.paityārem.frākereñtat. Aṣrōmainyush.pouru-mahrkō vithushāmcha.maredhāmcha*. To my mind a correction into *maredhācha* or *maredhācha* is absolutely necessary; *ām* actually served only as a sign of the nasalized in the accusative plural. One is tempted also to hold *vithushāmcha* to be the name (perhaps mutilated) of a nation.

² From root *mared*; comp. also Haug, in Bunsen, *Ägyptens Stellung in der Weltgeschichte*, v, p. 129.

³ Strabo, p. 523.

⁴ Forbiger, *H. a. G.* vol. ii, p. 595, note 20; Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. ii, p. 538 note.

⁵ Vd. I, 9, *āat.ahē : paityārem.frākereñtat. Aṣrō-mainyush.pouru-mahrkō : sarash-kemcha Driwikācha* ('hail-storms and the people of the Driwika').

⁶ For particulars, see Forbiger, *H. a. G.* vol. ii, p. 566.

⁷ The same is recounted of the Massagetæ (*H. a. G.* vol. ii, p. 467, note 16) and of certain Indian tribes (p. 494).

This sounds too cannibalistic not to rouse a suspicion that it is incredible. Still the narrative cannot be wholly without foundation, and if true only in part, it is still sufficient to set in a clear light the barbarous condition of the Derbikes.

There is a very striking correspondence between the name Derbikes and the proper name *Dṛbhika* in the *Rigveda* to which Ludwig refers¹. This occurs only in a single passage and there indeed in a somewhat mythical sense, which however is also sometimes the case with *Dāsa* and *Dānu* :

‘ Their priest, to him who slew the *Dṛbhika*,
Liberated the cows, opened the prison,
To Indra, who resembles the storm in the atmospheric space,
Covered with Soma, as the horse with trappings²!

Through the discovery of the same name, as that of a tribe, in the *Avesta*, the history of the word is completed, and is found to be identical with that of *Dāsa* or *Dānu*. Originally, in the Arian period, the word may have had a pretty general meaning. I would translate it by ‘ beggar folk, poor rabble³.’ The Arians, who were proud of their well-cultivated fields and their rich stock of cattle, seem then to have contemptuously designated by this expression the homeless nomadic people without possessions, whom they met on their marches. Among the Indians the meaning of the name was evidently forgotten during their migration into the Panjāb : and this fact would explain how it came to be used by them in a semi-mythical sense. It was merely a relic of antiquity. It still retained indeed the idea of the frightful and the terrible, but its proper application, its original significance, was no longer known. Among the Irānians on the contrary *Driwika* served, as we have already seen to have happened in the case of *Dāha*, no longer as a general designation of all nomadic tribes, but as the special name of a single race.⁴

The tribes which have so far been mentioned, dwelt either in Irān itself or in the countries on its northern border, which are generally comprised under the name *Tūrān*. Here, where desert and fertile land are in such close contiguity, the rivalry between the settled population and the nomads, and, at least partly, that between Arians and non-Arians must naturally have been keenest.

¹ *Einleitung*, p. 207.

² *Rig-veda* II, 14, 3, Roth’s translation (*B. R. sub voce jñ*); quite differently Ludwig, *Rv.* II, 57.

³ Cf. *Avesta driwi*, ‘ trash or trifle,’ *drighu*, ‘ poor,’ Skr. root *darbh*.

⁴ By the way, I am here giving only a conjecture regarding the obscure word *bravara* or *barvara* in *Vd.* I, 7, which is called *paityāra* in *Bākhdi*. I have long held it to be a name of a tribe; perhaps it may be the Iranian equivalent for the Greek *Βάρβαροι* (?) Now to my surprise I find the following notice in Grodekoff (‘ *Ride*,’ p. 79): ‘ The road was intersected by the River Balkh, locally known as the Bandi-Barbari. Bandi means “ beyond the pond ” (?)—the dam is constructed at the town of Balkh itself—and the term Barbari is applied to the wild people living among the northern spurs of the Paropamisus and the Hindukush ’ (? comp. also *Mod. Pers. barbar*, for which the meaning ‘ fight ’ is given by the lexicographers: *Vullers, Lex. sub voce*).

Here from the earliest times occasion was given for continual quarrels, and here broke out in remote antiquity that desperate conflict, which, as the war between Irān and Tūrān, engrosses a great part of the legendary history of Persia, and which, though in an altered form, continued down to modern times.

The question now arises whether the Irānians were not also engaged in contest with hostile tribes in the East and West. In the region of the Sulci-man mountains their territories apparently bordered on those of the kindred tribes of the Indians; and in the South-West, though indeed at a considerable distance, the Semites had established in the low country round the Euphrates and the Tigris a mighty kingdom whose military power was frequently felt by the inhabitants of the Irānian highland.

The Avesta seems to furnish hints of at least passing conflicts with Indian and Semitic nations; these, however, are in any case very doubtful and shrouded in myths and legends of many kinds. The Indian tribes are, I believe, comprehended in the *Gandarwa*, whose name can scarcely be separated from that of the mythical being Gandarwa of the Rig-veda. The home of the Gandarwa is placed in the extreme East; he was regarded as a terrible monster¹, bent upon killing the faithful, who was vanquished and slain in the valley of *Pishin* by the hero *Kersāspa*². We may perhaps place Pishin in the province of Urva, belonging to the list of countries where 'wicked inhabitants' are expressly spoken of. We know also that the scene of other adventures and exploits of *Kersāspa* is laid in the South-Eastern territories of the Avesta people³.

It is, further, generally assumed that the sufferings and miseries which came upon the Irānians from the Mesopotamian countries, particularly from Babylon, were embodied in the figure of *Azhi Dahāka*⁴. How much of a mythical element is contained in the legend of Dahāka may be clearly seen from the following passage describing the combat between Dahāka and his opponent *Thraitauna*:

This blessing fell to the lot of *Āthwya*, this boon was given him that a son was born to him: *Thraitauna*, from his mighty race, who slew the dragon *Dahāka* with the three jaws and the three heads, with the six eyes and the thousand limbs, the all-powerful, devilish monster; whom Angra Manyu created on the living world as the strongest monster to annihilate the people of the pious⁵.

¹ Comp. the *Kérvapou*

² *Yō.ajanat. Gañdarewem* gō.apatat. vīzafānō* mērekshānō. ashahē. gaethāō.* 'who slew Gandarwa, who rushed downward with open jaws to annihilate the people of the pious,' Yt. XIX, 41. *Gandarwa* may be perhaps regarded as the name of a tribe (Yt. XIII, 123), just as *Tūra* which immediately precedes it.

³ See pp. 81 and 113 of *Ostirānische Kultur*.

⁴ Justi, *Geschichte des alten Persiens*, p. 31; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 543 seq.

⁵ Ys. IX, 7-8. The description of Dahāka as *dēva* and *druj* is interesting: compare what is said above in pp. 20-21.

Many a passage may however be cited in confirmation of the historical basis of the myth of Dahāka. If the usual interpretation be correct, Babel which is called *Bawri* in the Avesta, should be regarded as the dwelling-place of Dahāka¹. Another locality with which he stands in closer connection would be *Kvirinta*, which has been ingeniously identified by Justi² with the *Karina* of Isidor of Charax, the present Kerend at the top of the pass of Zagros. In perfect accord with this is the epithet 'difficult to approach,' indicating the strength and strategical value of the place, which was indeed of importance, since the Assyrian princes must have led their armies through it, when they took the field against the inhabitants of the Irānian highland.

The name of Bawri as well as that of Kvirinta may have been known to the Avesta nation only from hearsay, for no passage in our texts justifies the supposition that they had then advanced so far to the South-West.

The historical evidences of a real, though only transient supremacy, of the Assyrian princes over Eastern Irān are, it must be confessed, very deficient. The Medo-Persian epic can indeed boast of mighty expeditions which Ninos and Semiramis undertook against the kingdom of Bactria, and tell of the fierce battles which preceded its subjugation. But these accounts can scarcely be regarded as genuinely historical, though they may have some foundation in fact. The Assyrian cuneiform writings only tell us of Tiglāth-Pileser, who lived in the eighth century, that in one of his expeditions he advanced a considerable distance towards the East. In them also appear some highly interesting names : Arakuttu, evidently Arachotos-Harahvati, Nisaa-Nisaya and Zikruti, the Sagartians, in the list of conquered territories and nations ; but these disappear again in the inscription containing the account of a later campaign and its result, a proof that the Assyrian dominion in Eastern Irān was not at all events of long duration³.

Nevertheless, it is by no means incredible that the more powerful among the rulers of Babylon and Assyria endeavoured at least to bring under their sway the Eastern districts of Irān, and that they reached so far in their more distant expeditions. Furthermore, it is not impossible that such attempts gave occasion for the rise of the myth of Dahāka or in some way caused its transformation. The later legend also represents Zohāk as coming from Arabia.⁴ That there was no permanent supremacy is proved by the Avesta itself. Dahāka is only for a limited period master over the Irānian nation ; foreign rule soon gave way again to the national dominion originally founded by the hero *Thraitaṇa* or Frēdūn. Thraitaṇa had concealed himself among the heights of

¹ *Bawrōish.paiti.danhaoyē(?)* 'in the country of Bawri,' Yt. V, 29. Therewith agree Hamza and the author of *Mujmil*, Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 532.

² *Hdb.* sub voce. *Tem.yazata.Azhish.thrijafāo. Dahākō.upa.Kvirīntem.duzhitem*, 'unto him did the three-headed dragon Dahāka offer up a sacrifice on the scarce accessible Kvirinta.' Yt. XV, 19.

³ Duncker, *GdA.* vol. ii, p. 261 ; Maspero, 'History,' pp. 366-368.

⁴ Spiegel, *E. A.* Vol. i, p. 531.

the Alburz, that is to say in the lofty mountains to the Eastward, which were at all times the place of refuge of the Irānians during hostile invasions. From hence, followed by the valiant body of his faithful adherents, he took the field against the usurper, defeated and killed him, and thus brought the foreign domination to an end.

If this view of the saga of Dahāka be correct, we have in it a peculiar commingling of legendary and purely mythological elements. If, on the one hand, it contains an historical nucleus, on the other it is certain that 'the dragon' signifies by natural symbolism the serpent of the clouds, and is identical with the *Ahi* of the Rig-veda, the demon of tempest, against whom the beneficent genii fight in storm and bad weather, in lightning and in thunder. Everywhere, in the Avesta as well as in the Rig-veda, the combats on the earth and in the air are confounded together. The Avesta also represents Dahāka in the figure of a serpent, while the later rationalistic legend describes him as a man with serpents' heads growing on his shoulders; it makes him three-headed with three jaws and six eyes, while he is also represented in the Yashts¹ as sitting upon a golden throne like an earthly potentate and king.

The relations, then, between the various populations of Turkistān and of Eastern Irān present a somewhat motley picture even in the earliest period. By far the larger portion of the land was inhabited by tribes of Arian race. These, however, did not form a concentrated and united whole, but were divided into hostile parties through differing habits of life and forms of religion.

The upholders of civilization were those Irānian tribes which professed the, Mazdian faith. They mostly dwelt in fixed settlements, cultivated the fields and practised the regular breeding of cattle. By way of exception, the Zoroastrian doctrine seems likewise to have made its way among semi-nomads.

In sharp contrast to the Avesta people stand the bulk of the nomadic tribes of Arian blood. They are mostly comprised under race-names such as Tūra or Dānu, perhaps also Sarima or Sāni. Certain individual tribes are to be understood by the names Driwika, Hyauna, Mardha, Dāha, etc.

At the same time we must admit the possibility that many of these tribes, e.g., the Hunu, belonged to a foreign, possibly the Tartarian, race. That close to the Irānians an aboriginal population not akin to them existed, is beyond a doubt. In the beginning this may have been powerful and numerous. But it gradually became reduced in numbers and withdrew before the victorious Arians into the more inaccessible mountains. The conquered portions became merged in the mass of the victors.

Finally, in the South-East as in the South-West, the Irānians came into contact with foreign nations: in the former with the Indians, in the latter with the Semites. Between them and the Indians of the border provinces continual but unimportant feuds and petty forms of warfare evidently prevailed; but the Semites made themselves hated and feared only by brief occasional campaigns.

¹ Yt. XV, 19.

CHAPTER II.¹

PRIVATE LIFE.

§ 5. *Physical Characteristics of men and women.*

. . . . WE have examined the nation itself as a whole with its division into the believing and the unbelieving, into husbandmen and nomads; we have discussed the opposition in which in Irān the Arians, who had immigrated, stood to an aboriginal population of foreign race. We now return to the, narrowest circle and consider the old Irānian as a single individual, the general circumstances of his life, and his position in the house and in the family.

What he was in outward appearance, we cannot easily state. The Avesta offers scarcely anything tangible, as it only touches occasionally upon this question. A comparison with the present descendants of the Avesta people is more profitable.

I will endeavour to delineate the ideal type which seems to have held the mind of the old Irānian. Naturally the reality cannot have invariably corresponded with the type.

In man the principal stress is laid upon bodily strength and health. Zarathushtra therefore prays for these to Verthraghna, the genius of victorious battle, whom fancy naturally endowed with extraordinary strength. They are the gifts for which one also implores Hauma, the *yazata*, who keeps away sickness and death.²

Wide chest, broad hips, high feet, and above all a clear sharp eye, are the glory of man. These are the attributes which distinguish the king who is to surpass his people not only by higher intelligence but also in bodily vigour and beauty.³

The descriptions of the divine beings may also be made use of, as they are certainly [*metaphorically*] spoken of as men perfectly well-formed. The Amesha Spenta, the highest spirits next to Ahura Mazda, are represented as 'endowed with sharp eyes.' The *manes*, the Fravashis, are called 'clear-sighted,' and the star Tishtrya-Sirius 'sharp-eyed.'⁴ These epithets sufficiently prove the importance which the Irānian attached to the shining brightness of the eye.

Tall in stature, slender in form, strong, able, clear-eyed, having small heels, long arms and handsome calves; all these are in the Avesta honourable epithets for *yazatas* and men.⁵

¹ Ch. iv, § 27, *Ostirānische Kultur*.

² Yt. XIV, 29: *bāzvaō.aajō, tanvō.vīspayāō.dravalātēm, tanvō-vīspayāō vuzdvare.*— Ys. IX, 19.

³ *Perethu-vara, perethu-sraoni, berezi-pādha, anakhrūidha-dōithra*, Yt. XV, 54.

⁴ *Verezi-dōithra*, Ys. XXVI, 3; *verezi-chashman*, Yt. XIII, 29; *drvō-chashman*, Yt. VIII, 12.

⁵ *Berczat, huradha, amavat, hunairyach, spiti-dōithra, kasupāshna, dareghō-bāzu, hvaschva*, Yt. VIII, 14; XI, 17; XVII, 22, &c.

In woman, beauty and elegance of figure are most conspicuous. Symmetry of shape, a slender waist and large full eyes, which are still admired at the present day in Irānian women, are esteemed as the principal of maidenly beauties. Other feminine graces are light complexion, especially about the arms, small slender fingers and a well-formed bosom¹.

It is remarkable that the fifteenth year of a man's life is esteemed as his ideal age, which is regarded as the period during which he who is still in the freshness of youth approaches the work and miseries of life, not with a weak body but in full vigour, the time when the youth comes to the age of puberty². As youths of fifteen, men wandered on earth in the golden age during the reign of Yima, the father like the son. In like youthfulness also appears Verthraghna the genius of victory³.

Bodily development ought to be very rapid when such an early age is esteemed the most beautiful one, and this fact stands in the closest connection with climatic circumstances. What we know of the Persians of the present day accords with the above statement. Youths as a rule attain to puberty in their fourteenth year, and are in the habit of marrying shortly after. In old Irān these circumstances must have been quite the same, and the youth was already in full manhood at an age in which, in colder latitudes, he has scarcely passed the age of boyhood.

The statements of the Avesta respecting the exterior in the old Irānian, are, as we see, of a very general kind, and as deficient as insignificant. On just the most important and most decisive points, such as the colour of the hair, the structure of the skull, and the size of the men's beards, we know nothing. It is therefore necessary to supplement the incomplete description of the Avesta by a study of the present descendants of the old Irānian nation. Important to us is the description of the Eastern Irānians, which I have already given above. By means of the same we may perhaps more or less correctly describe the external appearance of the old Irānians in the following manner⁴:

The men were of middle, often of high stature, and were strong-built, with broad and well-developed chests. With the girls and women the general tendency was towards a slender and supple formation of body, the colour of their skin was brighter and more delicate, particularly on those parts of the body which were protected from the influence of the sun. Large shining eyes distinguished both men and women. The beards of the men were of luxuriant growth. The majority of the people had probably dark brown hair; but light

¹ Comp. the epithets *huraodha*, *urvaēzō-maidhya*, *vouru-dōithra*; Vsp. II, 7: *ghenāo*, *hubaghāo*, *hufedhrish*, *huraodhāōhō*, 'the lovely women of good family (elsewhere *āzāta*), the well-grown up.' Vide Yt. V, 127, *yathacha* . *hukerepta* . *fshtāna* . *āñhen* . *yathacha* . *āñhen*, *navāzāna* (=N.P. *navzān*, 'the lovely, charming, alluring').

² 'At the age (*ayu*) in which man first grows up to manhood, first comes to strength first attains to puberty.' Yt. VIII, 14.

³ Ya. IX, 5; Yt. XIV, 17; comp. also Yt. XXII, 9.

⁴ Comp. Ch. I, § 1, pp. 6-7.

brown and red hair were not uncommon. Both types, the dark and the light, are generally to be distinguished among the Arians. The brachycephalous structure of the skull was general, the form of the face was oval; nose, mouth, and forehead, and even the extremities, hands and feet, were well-shaped.

§ 6. *Dwelling, Clothing, and Food.*

THE general circumstances of life in which the old Irānian people lived were throughout plain and simple, so far as we can learn from the Avesta. Here we observe nothing of that luxury which prevailed later on in the courts of great Persian kings and in the palaces of Persian nobles. The Avesta people consisted of herdsmen and peasants, and the richest amongst them were distinguished from the humbler and less important class only by their larger estates and herds. Money, the first requisite of commerce, even of the rudest kind, was unknown; cattle formed the means of barter and payment. No mention is made of the importation of foreign goods. The natural products which the Avesta mentions are without exception indigenous.

The soil of Irān itself was poor, yielding only scanty crops, a fact which rendered sloth impossible and enforced diligence, perseverance, and thrift. The chief sources of luxury, fruitfulness of soil, and extensive mercantile intercourse, were consequently denied to the Avesta people, and the conditions of a simple, frugal and unostentatious life were alone known to them.

Hence we can say that the wants of the Avesta people, in reference to dwelling, dress, and food, hardly went beyond the necessities of life. Compared with the things which were necessary and useful for human life, everything that tended to its embellishment and refinement was of subordinate importance.

* * * * *

§ 7. *Birth, Education, and Admission into the Community.*

WE now trace the career of the old Irānian during the years of his youth from his birth to the solemn act by which he was admitted, as a duly recognized member, into the Zoroastrian community.

‘The desire for progeny’ (*puthrō-ishti*) is the motive for marriage-conclusion¹. If a marriage proves childless, the real object has been frustrated. It was regarded as evidently a divine visitation. Childlessness is a curse, which the yazatas inflict upon those who sin against them :

‘Hauma accurses him who shall drink it : “Childless shalt thou become and infected with ill-repute, thou who withholdest my juice like a profligate thief” ’

Posterity is a gracious favour bestowed by Heaven as a reward for virtuous behaviour and piety. ‘The blissful holy Frava shis, the *manes*, grant bodily

¹ Vd. III, 33.

² Ys. XI, 3; Geldner, *Metrik*, § 116.

offspring to those who do not violate agreements.¹ It is particularly Mithra who blesses with children. Hence he is called *puhrō-dāo*, 'the bestower of sons.'² He allows the progeny of his adorers to increase and prosper; while he annihilates the offspring of those who transgress his commands and excite his displeasure:—

'Blood-stained are the settlements, the abodes deprived of their offspring, in which promise-breakers dwell.'

'Who will revere me, who will deceive me, who will hold me worthy of veneration with good or evil sacrifices? On whom shall I bestow wealth and fortune, to whom shall I give health of body, I who am able to do so? To whom shall I grant blissful plenty. I who am able to do so? To whom shall I grant the happiness of bodily offspring? To whom shall I send sickness and death, to whom want and misery, I who am able to do so? Whose bodily offspring shall I destroy at one stroke?'³

Naturally it is for sons especially that the yazatas are invoked. Daughters are certainly less desirable. Moreover sons are also the proper defenders of the house. They must guard it from enemies and adversaries, they must stand round their father when he goes into battle, they must propagate his race and improve and increase his estates.

The greater the number of sons the better secured was the stability of the house and of the family. 'Which is, secondly, the place where the earth is most delightful? Where a pious man builds a house in which there are fire, cattle, women, sons, and menials. Henceforth also shall there be in that house abundance of cattle, bread and fodder, dogs, women and children, and every enjoyment of life⁴.'

When the Irānian prays for wealth in men (*vīryām-ishtīm*) and numbers of men⁵. (*vīryām-vāthwām*), he certainly and particularly means brave sons who offer him the best guarantee for the perpetuation and prosperity of his family.

1 Yt. X, 3. [Rather those who do not violate the sacred bonds of marriage. It is indeed a fact worthy of notice in the sacred lore of the Avesta nation that even the Fravashis, of the departed adherents of the religion of Zarathushtra, bear ancestral love and good-will towards their survivors on earth after their exit from this world. *Tr.*]

2 Yt. X, 65. [Mithra, the yazata presiding over love and friendship or love itself, blesses faithful wives and husbands with offspring, i.e., those who duly observe the holy ties of wedlock. The violation of such ties, it is said metaphorically, brings misery and misfortune upon the family. *Tr.*]

3 Yt. X, 38, 108, 110. Comp. Geldner, *Metrik*, § 127.

4 Vd. III, 2, 3; comp. *ZddmG.* vol. xxxiv, p. 416. Here '*asha*' cannot possibly mean 'piety.' From the context and from a comparison of Vd. V, 52 where '*yaomcha. ashem*' occurs, I infer the meaning to be 'bread' or 'food.' The Greek word ἀρός need hardly be referred to, Comp. also Hubschmann, *Zdm. G.* 1884, P. 428.

5 Yt. VIII, 15; comp. also Vd. XVIII, 27: 'Thee shall follow herds of cattle and a multitude of heroes.'

Therein concentrating all his wishes, he addresses himself to the genius of fire¹, that forms the centre of all family life, with the words : ' Give me bodily offspring who may found habitations, who may gather around me, who may grow up strong to be a protection in danger, consisting of heroes, who will promote the welfare of my house !'²

Hence it is an occasion of joy in the house of the Mazdayasna, when the wife has conceived³, and a child is hoped for. At this time the woman requires more than ever heavenly protection, that her offspring may be unharmed, and herself propitiously delivered. For this reason she appeals by means of her prayers to Hauma, and still more to the special tutelary *yazata* of the female sex, Ardvī-sūra Anāhita. The former protects women at the time of delivery, and bestows on them brave sons and pious children⁴. Of Anāhita it is said in the hymns addressed to her, that she aids the generation of men and prepares all women for childbirth, that she helps all women towards a happy delivery and bestows on them sufficient and well-timed milk⁵.

During pregnancy, and even for some time after delivery, women should hold aloof from conjugal intercourse⁶. The tenth month was the normal time for confinement.

The first ceremony performed on a new-born child, appears to have been the washing of its hands⁷. The fundamental idea involved in this symbolical treatment is that the impurity which is contracted by conception, and which communicates itself also to the child, must be washed off with the purifying element of water. This clearly explains why a woman after confinement is for some time looked upon as unclean.

The antiquity of this custom is proved by quite similar ceremonies among the Indians, who were accustomed to wash a child on the eighth day after its birth ; nay more, it is even proved by those practised among the old Germans⁸.

¹ [As it is a religious custom amongst the Zarathushtrians to invoke the blessing and help of the Deity and other spiritual genii, with their faces turned towards the sacred fire (be it the hearth-fire or that of the sacred altar), so also here the adorer, asking for heroic sons of the above description, prays to Ahuramazda indirectly through the hearth-fire which he regards as the emblem of God. *Tr.*]

² Ys. LXII, 5 ; comp. Yt. XIII, 134 ; XIX, 75.

³ *Apuθra*=ā+*puθra* ; Geldner, *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, XXV, p. 193, note 3.

⁴ Ys. IX, 22 : *Haomō.āzizanāitibīsh*dadhāiti.khshaqtō-puthrim*uta.ashava.frazaīntim.*

⁵ Yt. V, 2.

⁶ Vd. XV, 8.

⁷ Vd. XVI, 7 : *Yęzi.aperenāyūkō.frāshnavāt.zasta.hę.paoirtm.frasnādhayen.aętahę.yat.aperenāyūkahō*, 'when the child comes into appearance (is born), they shall wash first the hands of it, viz., the child.' [Here we differ from the author's meaning and would render the passage thus : 'If a child should touch her, they should first of all wash both the hands of it, (that is) of the child.' Here the context plainly shows that we have to do not only with a woman who has just been delivered but one who is in her courses, and consequently the question does not refer only to a child just born but to any child that is supposed to have become unclean by coming in contact with its mother. The precept of the Vendidad, therefore, refers to the first washing of the hands of any child that has touched a menstruating woman. *Tr.*]

⁸ Zimmer, *AiL.* 320-321 ; Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, p. 262.

The birth of a son was celebrated as a festival in the family of a Mazdayasna. Such old customs are retained in our own time among the Mahomedan Tājiks, in Kohistān, in whom we can safely recognize the remnants of the old Arian population¹. Among them the parents prepare a feast when a child comes into this world. The mother keeps her bed for five or six days, and a week after the child receives its name in the presence of the Mullān.

With respect to the giving of names amongst the Avesta nation and the ceremonies usually connected therewith, we know nothing at present. Among the modern Parsees it certainly takes place under solemn formalities².

The mother suckled her child at her own breast; the father's duty was chiefly to preserve it from every danger. Both the parents together sought by offerings and prayers to the divine beings to induce them to take the child under their special protection, and to allow it to grow and thrive in strength and happiness³.

As to the child's education, their first aim was to make of him an able and useful member of their community and to implant in him those virtues for which the old Irānian people were principally remarkable, and which the Avesta sums up in the words: 'piety in thought, word and action.'

It is pretty clear that the special training of boys for future callings went hand in hand with their religious education, and that it was chiefly regulated according to the profession of the father. The warrior would have his son instructed in the handling of weapons, and the use of the bow, the lance and the sword. The peasant took his children out with him to the field and showed them how to manage the plough, to scatter seed, or gather in corn. Lastly, the priest initiated his sons in the understanding of the Holy Scriptures and their commandments, and fostered in them the consciousness of the sanctity and dignity of their peculiar position.

As even now the *vis inertiae* is a great factor in the choice of a profession how much more powerful must it have been before the existence of that universal intercourse which destroys all class distinctions.

It was evidently also no uncommon practice to commit children to the care of a priest for training and instruction in the same manner as the Indian Brahmins were wont to do. This practice must certainly have prevailed most among those who were destined for ecclesiastical functions, and the most

¹ Ujfalvy, *Expéd. scient.* i, p. 15. Upon the birthday festival among the Western Iranians, *vide* Duncker, *GdA.* iv, pp. 164-165 Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, 706.

² Dossabhoy Framjee, 'The Parsees,' pp. 64-65; Spiegel *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 700. [No formalities to my knowledge are generally observed by us at the present day. By the by, it may be said that the initiation into the historical knowledge of our ancestors has led to one social reform, *viz.*, that the mother is not so much inclined to name her child after the manner of Hindoos, as to call it by one of the glorious names of her heroic ancestors. Now-a-days, I believe there are more *Rustams*, *Jehangirs*, and *Shirins* than there were thirty years back. *Tr.*]

³ This is evident from the idea contained in Vd. III, 31, upon which compare my remarks in *ZddmG*, vol. xxxiv, p. 423.

essential subject of instruction was of course the interpretation of the Holy Text, the right performance of ceremonies, and the ritual of sacrifice. The relation between these teachers and their pupils is not often mentioned in the Avesta, yet we see that it was one of love and friendship ¹.

Youths or maidens were solemnly admitted into the Zoroastrian community by investing them with the sacred string². . . . The girdle is the symbol of the spiritual tie which binds together the whole Zoroastrian community. Men as well as women were wont to wear it continually The modern Parsees call it *kosti*. The *kosti* is a woollen string consisting of seventy-two threads, the manufacture of which is accompanied by certain ceremonies. The season of investiture is now earlier than it used to be in ancient times. In other respects the ideas of the present Parsees with reference to the object and importance of the *kosti* correspond, so far as we know, with those of the Avesta.

From the religious point of view, investiture with the sacred girdle may be compared with confirmation in the Christian Churches, and, from the legal point of view, with a declaration of majority, i.e., with the coming of age. Whoever wore the *kosti* belonged to the adult members of the community and was entitled to all its privileges. He was then relieved from parental discipline, and naturally took upon himself, with his personal independence also the entire moral and civil responsibility of all his actions, which the parents had hitherto borne wholly or in part.

The religious importance of this act is evidently far more interesting to the composers of the Parsee Scriptures than its civil aspect. Nevertheless we assume that the youth was admitted by this act, not only into the religious community of the Zoroastrians, but also at the same time into the army and to new family ties, and was regarded as capable of bearing arms and qualified to vote. Henceforth he was entitled to bear arms and to take a part in the meetings and councils of the village community, he could acquire landed property and manage his own domestic concerns; in short, he became a perfect citizen of the state.

Of the ceremonies accompanying the investiture with the *kosti* nothing is mentioned in the Avesta; however, we know that this custom is very ancient, in no way invented or first introduced by the Avesta people, but only developed and modified to suit their particular ideas.

Amongst the Indians the so-called 'conveyance'⁴ corresponds with it. By this the sons of the three higher castes were entrusted to the care of a Brahmin teacher when they had attained a certain age. Like the Irānian youths they were invested with a sacred string, and the ceremony took place under

¹ Yt. X, 116. The pupil is called *hāvishta* or *aθhrya*, the teacher *aθhrapaiti*.

² *Aiwyaōghana*, 'girdle.'

³ Dossabhoy Framjee, 'The Parsees,' p. 67; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, pp. 700-701.

⁴ *Upanayana* (*B. R. s. v.*); Manu, II, 36; vide Deslongchamps, *Loi de Manu traduite*, 33, note 1; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 136.

solemn consecrations and prayers. Here also this act originally marked the admission of boys and youths to the right of contracting family ties. In the Brahmanical period, however, the holy thread became the distinguishing badge of the *dvija*, 'the twice-born' and the investiture itself was regarded as the sacred new-birth which distinguished the three higher castes from the Sudras, and was considered as the badge of their higher enlightenment.

§ 8. *Love and Marriage.*

THE fifteenth year of age was the normal time of marriage for girls ¹.

As the raising of children was considered a duty and their acquisition a blessing, it was naturally wrong and monstrous if a woman did not fulfil her vocation ². Besides, it was deemed a grievous sin forcibly to hinder a maiden from contracting marriage :—

'For her third complaint mourns the good *Ashi*, the sublime : "That is the worst deed which hostile men commit, when they keep a maiden from marriage and immure her as an unmarried one ³."

Hence, no doubt, it was considered a matter of course, as it is still in Persia ⁴, that a girl should be married on reaching the years of puberty. A young woman who lost her bloom and grew old unmarried, was merely a useless burden in the house of her parents. It even seems that she was frequently subject to taunts and mortification, at all events to general disrespect.

For this reason the thoughts and aspirations of the young daughter of a Mazdayasna were directed towards obtaining a lord and husband, who would take her to his own house ; and this most heart-felt of all wishes is expressed with simple candour.

Loud and silent prayers arise to the *yazatas*, especially to Ardvī-sūra, of whom it is said : 'Thee, maidens, when they are fit for marriage, implore for strong men and valiant husbands ⁵.' But the *yazata* of wind, Vayu, who otherwise usually has nothing to do with such matters, is also invoked :

'Grant us this grace, that we may obtain a husband, a youthful one, one of surpassing beauty, who may procure us sustenance as long as we have to live with each other, and who will beget us offspring :—
[a wise learned, ready-tongued husband ⁶].'

¹ Vd. XIV, 15.

² The tract *Shāyast-la-Shāyast* says : 'The rule is this, that a man, when he does not wed a wife, does not become worthy of death; but when a woman does not wed a husband it amounts to a sin worthy of death ; because for a woman there is no offspring except by intercourse with men, and no lineage proceeds from her ; but for a man without a wife, when he shall recite the Avesta as it is mentioned in the Vendidad, there may be a lineage which proceeds onwards to the future existence.' West, 'Pahlavi Texts,' part, I, pp. 322-323 ; comp. Vd. XVIII, 51.

³ Yt. XVII, 59.

⁴ Polak, *Persien* vol. i, p. 205.

⁵ Yt. V, 87. For a surely very doubtful attempt at interpreting this extremely difficult passage vide *Handbuch*, p. 132.

⁶ Yt. XV, 40. This passage is evidently corrupt. The correction *yavānem.sraṣahto kehrpem* for *yavāna.sraṣhta* (var. ō) *kehrpa* can scarcely be avoided. Similarly I read *huberetim* instead of *huberetām*.

In extreme cases Hauma also is a helper in need, and 'grants to the maiden who have long remained unmarried, an able, wise husband, who quickly courts them ¹.'

The *courting*, or, as it is strictly translated, the *solicitation*² for the hand of a maiden, was made to those persons under whose care she stood, that is, above all, to the parents or their representatives. Sometimes, however, women appear to have been independent, and to have been thus able to dispose of themselves as they chose ³.

Whether the motive for marriage was at times real love or merely the natural impulse and wish for a home, we can hardly ascertain. However, it would be better not to judge merely from modern ideas and views of so old a period and of the peculiar sphere of the East. If the marriage of a grown-up daughter with an orthodox husband may be reckoned as a merit to the Mazdayasna, if it may even be prescribed to him as a penance for certain transgressions ⁴, such marriage assumes indeed the character of a purely business-like transaction, in which the sentiments and feelings of the persons most interested are generally not taken into account.

Contrasted with the foregoing, a stanza in the *Gāthās*, if rightly interpreted, appears to contain a higher and purer idea of marriage, and to regard it as an intimate union founded on love and piety. On the occasion of the celebration of a marriage, the priestly Singer addresses, as I would believe, the young people, with these words :

*Sāqēni • vazyamnābyō • kainibyō • mraomī •
Kshmaibyāchā • vaēdemnō • meñchā • i • mōzdazdūm •
Vaēdōdūm • Daēnābish • abyaschā • ahūm • yē • vaǵhēush • manaǵhō.
Ashā • vē • anyō • ainim • vivaǵhatū • tat • zī • hōi • hushēnem •
aǵhat.*

'Admonishing words I say unto the maidens, who will enter into marriage,

And to you (the youth) I, who know it ; take them to heart ;

Learn to know, through Religion and of these(the parents?) the life of a good mind ;

In piety you shall both seek to win the love of each other, only thus will it lead you to joy !' ⁵

¹ Ys. IX, 23. Unmarried women are called *aghru*, which has naturally nothing to do with rt. *garew*, as I have wrongly taken it in my *Hdb. Glossar.* s. v.

² *Jadh* in *moshu-jaidhyamna*.

³ So at least according to Vd. XV, 9, if here *stātū-ratu* and *astātū-ratu* may be translated by 'standing under the care of any one' and 'not standing under the care of any one.'

⁴ Vd. XIV, 15.

⁵ Ys. LIII, 5. In stanza 2, of *Gāthā*, 64, Bartholomä reads *vaēdemanō* instead of the certainly much better verified *vademanō*. If we accept the last reading, this stanza would be appropriate in the mouth of the bridegroom. Touching this I refer also to the Pahlavi translation which must have likewise read *vaēdemanō*, for it renders the word by *ākōsth*. I identify *vivaǵhatū* with Skr. *vivāś*.

The courtship was followed by the *betrothal*, through which the girl was entrusted to the man¹. Between the betrothal and nuptials some further time elapsed. Among the Gebers in Kirmān, a girl is betrothed at the age of nine, and married at thirteen. With the Parsees of India the betrothal takes place still earlier. The marriage ceremony consists in joining the hands of a young man and woman, while prayers and holy formulas are recited². Through the touching of their hands the union is made a legal compact.

Of a similar kind were most likely the holy rites which were observed at the conclusion of a marriage (*nāirithwana*)³. Therewith, the bride, magnificently adorned⁴, was conveyed, under various solemn customs and observances, from the house of her parents to that of her husband, which was to become henceforth her new home. Hence the Irānian speaks of a 'taking home' of the wife⁵ just as the Greek does of the *ἄγεσθαι γυναῖκα* and the Roman of a *ducere puellam in matrimonium*⁶.

It is characteristic, as bearing upon the legal and moral position of the wife in the old Irānian house, that she bears from the marriage-day the title of *nmānō-pathni*, 'the mistress of the house,' just as the husband is called *nmānō-paiti*, 'the master of the house'. The wife ranks thus more as the equal of the husband than his dependent. She is not his slave but his companion, entitled to all his privileges, sharing with him the direction and management of the household.

Whilst the man has chiefly to procure through the labour of his hands the necessary means of maintenance for his family, and therefore moves more out of doors, the wife's sphere of action is indoors. As the cultivation of the field, the chase, and war are incumbent upon him, so does she tend the domestic herd, devoting herself to the care and primary training of her children, and to the preparation of food, and the making of needful clothing and other articles of home manufacture.

We shall therefore not err in conceding to woman in ancient Irān nearly the same social position as that occupied by the wife among the Vedic Indians, the Germans, or the Greeks of the age of Homer. Among all these peoples we meet with the same social relations. It is true the man represents the highest

1 Thus *paradhāta* and *aparadhāta* (Vd. XV, 9), 'betrothed' and 'unbetrothed,' come from rt. *dā* with *para*. Also in Skr. *parā-dā*, 'to give up, to surrender,' is mentioned.

2 Dossabhoy Framjee, 'The Parsees,' p. 76; Spiegel. *Av. üb.* vol. ii, p. xxviii, seq. *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 677.

3 Vd. XIV, 15.

4 Comp. p. 226 of *Ostiranische Kultur*.

5 *Vadh*, 'to lead.' This verb itself has disappeared from old Indian, and it is only preserved in its derivative *vadhū*, which has no connection with *val*. Besides in the *Avesta* *vaz* is also used to denote 'to marry, to take home (a bride).'

6 Respecting the marriage customs prevailing amongst the Indians I refer to Zimmer, *AltL.* pp. 312-313; Lefmann, *Geschichte des alten Indiens*, p. 99 seq.

7 Actually corresponding to the Rv. *grhapati* and *grhapatni*. In Vd. XII, 7 *nmānō-paiti* and *nmānō-pathni* are as 'husband' and 'wife.'

power in his small house-state, and the wife too must be willing and obedient to him like his children and domestics, but she is in no way degraded to the rank of a maid-servant or slave, as was the case in Eastern countries even at a very early period¹.

In the Avesta both sexes appear constantly as possessing equal rights ; there is no difference as to their respective importance. Pious men and women are frequently named together. As in this world, so also in the next, they live together, enjoying in common the pleasures of Paradise². Wives are an honour to the house³ ; and the good spirits, particularly Ahura Mazda, are represented as being in the company of female yazatas⁴.

As in the Vedic antiquity, so also amongst the Avesta people, women took part even in the holy ceremonies and solemn offerings. The ladies of the house who cherish good thoughts, utter good words, and perform good actions, who are obedient and subject to their lords, are invited in the Vispered at the offering ceremony equally with pious and orthodox men⁵. Further on it is said that both wife and husband naturally pray together, with uplifted hands, to Mithra for his protection and support⁶. The following remarkable saying of the Rig-veda is also in accordance with Irānian custom : 'Already from olden time the wife has attended the common sacrificial offerings and festive gatherings, she, the fosterer of the holy law⁷'.

The first and strictest demand which the bridegroom made of the bride was, that her name and reputation should be pure and unspotted⁸, and her virginity before marriage unstained⁹. This demand is enforced with unrelenting severity among the Persians of the present day, though their morality

¹ I give here as an appendix the names of relations occurring in the Avesta : *pitare* =Skr. *pitṛ* 'father,' *mātare*=Skr. *mātṛ* 'mother' ; *puṭhra*=Skr. *putra* 'son,' *dughdhare* =Skr. *duhitṛ* 'daughter' ; *nyāka*=N.P. *niyā* (not corresponding to the Indian) 'grand-father,' *nyākē* 'grandmother' ; *napāt*=Skr. *napāt* 'grandson,' *napti* 'grand-daughter'. *brātuirya*=Skr. *bhrātṛvya*, masc. 'uncle,' fem. 'aunt' ; *tūirya* 'nephew, niece.' Hence further on we avail ourselves of a circumscription, viz., *tūirya puṭhra* and *tūirya dughdhare* *tūirya puṭhra puṭhra* and *tūirya dughdhare dughdhare* relations in the fourth and fifth generation. Comp. Vd. XII. Comp. further *hvasura* 'father-in-law'—Skr. *çvaçura*, and *zāmātar* 'son-in-law' =Skr. *jāmātṛ* ; *brātare* 'brother' =Skr. *bhrātṛ*, and *hvaḡhar* 'sister' =Skr. *svasṛ*.

² Vd. IX, 42 ; Ys. XXVI, 8 ; XXXIX, 2 ; Yt. XI, 4, &c.

³ Vd. III, 3.

⁴ Ys. XXXVIII, 1.

⁵ Vsp. III, 3 ; *yavānem.humanaghēm.huvachaghēm.hushkyaothnem.hudaenem.āstāya . . . nmānahe.nmānō-pathnām.āstāya, nāirikāmcha.āstāya.frāyō-humatām . frāyō-hūkhtām frāyō-hūvarshām.hush-hām-sūstām.ratu-kshhathrām.*

⁶ Yt. X, 84. Very obscure and doubtful. The word translated by me by 'both wife and husband' is *piṭhē*. Cf. Spiegel, *Commentar*, vol. ii, pp. 566-567 ; C. de Harlez, *Av. tr.* vol. ii, p. 236.

⁷ Rv. X, 86, 10 ; Zimmer, *ÄiL.* pp. 316-317.

⁸ *Nāmēni* (Vd. XIV, 15) is certainly correctly translated by de Harlez by 'elle diot être de bonne réputation' (she has to be of good reputation).

⁹ Vd. XIV, 15, *anupaṣta* and *askeṇḍa*, the former from root *i* with *upa* also Skr. *upa-i* means *coire cum femina*, the latter is supposed to be connected according to Geldner (*K. Z.* vol. xxv, p. 211, note 1) with Skr. *skanda*, 'profusio seminis.'

is rather lax. The simple accusation of the husband is sufficient to divorce young wife and to expose her to misery and shame¹. This peculiar destiny of women, which naturally paves the way for the most shameful abuses, has at least this one advantage that offences against morality are very rare amongst unmarried girls in Persia.

Marriage between blood-relations was forbidden among the old Indians. They exhibit even a religious dread of consanguinity in marriage. As to the Rig-veda, this idea is clearly demonstrated by a remarkable song already often quoted, which contains a dialogue between Yama and his sister Yamī². Here the latter tries to decoy her brother into love, but she is rejected by him with an express appeal to the gods who had forbidden such sin.

How entirely different is the case in the Avesta ! Here the marriage of relations is not only unforbidden but even recommended, and described as a meritorious and pious action. It is esteemed as an institution that has proceeded from Mazda and Zarathushtra, and is thus sanctioned as a very ancient custom and a divine ordinance³.

Later writers also of the traditional Parsee literature frequently expatiate upon kindred-marriages. The *Bahman Yasht* plainly puts the following words into the mouth of Ahura Mazda : 'The most perfectly righteous of the righteous is he who remains in the good religion of the Mazdayasnān, and continues the religious practice of kindred-marriage in his family ;' and, according to the *Shāyast-la-shāyast*, such a marriage is in itself capable of expiating mortal or heinous sins, and serves as an efficient and powerful weapon against the evil spirit Ahriman⁴.

It is frequently observed that the Avesta people set a high value on the preservation of the purity of their blood, and stood in great fear of its intermixture with foreign elements. This principle was followed to the utmost extreme in the introduction of marriage among relations

¹ Polak, *Persien*, vol. i, p. 213.

² Rv. X, 10 ; Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 323.

³ The technical expression is *hvaetvadatha* ; comp. particularly Ys. XII, 9 ; Vsp. III, 3. [We understand the passage (Ys. XII, 9) quite differently. Here *hvaetvadathām* is to be taken as a noun used adjectively and qualifying *Daēnām*. *Āstuyē. Daēnām. Māzdayasnēm. fraspāyō-khcdhrām. nidhā-snaithishem. hvaetva-dathām. ashaonīm*. 'I extol, the Mazda-worshipping Religion (i.e., the Religion that commands its followers to adore the Wisdom of the Creator), that is far from all doubt, that levels all arguments (disputes). the sacred one which is itself a tie that unites (the spiritual man with God).' Here *hvaetvadathām*, we believe, does not properly refer to marriage among mankind, as Dr. Spiegel and others have endeavoured to interpret it, but it rather signifies that the Religion revealed to Zarathushtra by Ahura Mazda is the only medium on earth, the sincere belief in which infallibly conduces so to exalt the human mind as to bring it to a clear conception of the Deity. Whatever might be the view of the later Pahlavi writers with regard to the word *khvetudas*, we have no single instance in the Avesta which can suggest the idea that amongst the Avesta nation there ever was a marriage contracted between brother and sister. See the question fully examined by Dr. West, 'Pahlavi Texts,' part ii, Appendix.—Tr.].

⁴ *Bahman Yasht*, chap. ii, p. 61 ; *Sh.-lā-sh.* VIII, 18 ; XVIII, 3. Vide West, 'Pahlavi Texts', part i, pp. 213, 307, 387.

Among modern Persians kindred-marriage is not rare. It is here evidently a remnant of antiquity which has been preserved to the present day, with the tenacity peculiar to such family institutions, in spite of the entirely altered circumstances under which they now live. Besides, this custom, as we learn from well-informed judges, is by no means attended with results disastrous to the children¹.

In conclusion, I come to the question whether monogamy or polygamy existed amongst the Avesta people.

I premise that the bare principle only is here to be treated of, and not its practical application. Persons in poor and embarrassed circumstances, who were not in a position to support several wives and a larger number of children were perforce obliged to be content with *one* wife. We must absolutely set aside the question concerning concubines or persons who lived in a state of concubinage. Polygamy properly so called is only spoken of where several women occupy towards one man the same lawful rank, and where the children of all of them are considered to have been begotten in lawful wedlock.

Unfortunately in the Avesta there is a lack of positive testimony as much concerning the one, (monogamy) as concerning the other (polygamy) and we must therefore content ourselves with merely indirect proofs and conclusions drawn from analogy.

Sons and wives are esteemed as an ornament to a house, and the *yazatas* bestow them upon the pious in abundance. This might be construed as an indication that polygamy was customary and a great number of women a mark of opulence and divine blessing². . . .

However, it would be better not to lay too much stress upon such isolated passages of almost universal import, nor to draw from them any far-fetched conclusions.

The Parsees of India live, as we know, in monogamy, But that is in no way an original custom. A short time ago bigamy was in general use³. So too we learn of the Tājiks living in the mountains of Zerafshān that with them polygamy is indeed not the rule but is by no means forbidden⁴.

The modern Persians and their marriage customs may therefore be used for comparison only with great reserve, since they naturally come under the

¹ Polak, *Persien*, vol. i, pp. 200-201.

² [The passage wherein the Avesta esteems 'sons and wives as an ornament to a family,' does not imply the wives of a single man but all the married women living in the same house. Just as is the case now in Parsee families, so also in the age of the Avesta may we conceive a Zoroastrian family as having married daughters, daughters-in-law, and even grand-daughters-in-law with the *mater-familias* at their head, all forming a group of more than a dozen women. Even when the Zoroastrian prays for sons, he does not generally pray for sons only but for sons and wives, i.e., sons who should be sufficiently well settled in life to afford to marry as well as to maintain households of their own. *Tr.*]

³ Dossabhoy Framjee, 'The Parsees,' p. 88 seq.

⁴ Ujfalvy, *Expéd. scient.* i, p. 16.

influence of Islāmism. But amongst the old Persians polygamy was commonly practised

I shall go even further. Among the old Indians, also, it is supposed on the authority of some passages of the *Rig-veda*, and indeed evidently with full justice, that at least men of rank frequently enjoyed a plurality of wives¹. There is likewise no doubt, that in ancient Germany, particularly in the case of princes and grandees, polygamy was an old and primitive custom which was only in course of time replaced by monogamy.²

We have here numerous analogies and grounds of probability which appear to speak in favour of the antiquity and priority of the custom of polygamy. In support of any contradictory opinion I have nothing to bring forward.

Under such circumstances I consider it almost certain that plurality of wives was not prohibited to the Avesta nation. Probably every one was free to do as he liked. Whoever was able to maintain more wives and a larger household could marry several ; whoever could not afford it, contented himself with only *one*. The precepts of their religion left this question wholly untouched, because there was no question at all of that custom being allowable or not allowable, or of its being right or wrong, but simply an accidental or personal ability or inability. In this way the silence of the Avesta is most simply explained. Had the Avesta prescribed monogamy, thus being in conflict with the custom which we know to have prevailed elsewhere in the country of Irān, there would have been certainly no lack of passages which opposed and attacked polygamy, and which represented the new institute of monogamy as sacred and divinely established.

Finally, I must further add that polygamy is not at all against the natural order, and as regards its practice in the Orient it is even explained and justified by the nature of the climate. It is even doubly intelligible in a nation that lay so great a value upon a numerous posterity as is known to have been done by the Avesta people.

§ 9. *Prayers and household Customs.*

THE scantiness of our references unfortunately does not allow us to describe on the basis of the Avesta-text, the daily life of the Zoroastrian, the arrangement of his household, his professional and religious duties and occupations, and the change from labour to relaxation.

We can here only discuss the most important customs and ceremonies which are prescribed to the Mazdayasnān, men as well as women, as a regular exercise, or to meet certain occasions of daily life.

The whole life of the faithful man was, according to the view of the Avesta, a conflict with the powers of darkness, with Angra Mainyu and his demons. He was threatened on all sides with their persecution. He had to remain ever

¹ Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 324 ; Lefmann, *Geschichte des alten Indiens*, p. 98 ; Kägi, *Der Rig-veda*, XV.

² Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, p. 248 seq.

on his guard lest he should have to yield to the evil power through some transgression. He was however enjoined to extend and strengthen the kingdom of light and to impair and diminish that of darkness, through his active interference in the great struggle between the heavenly and the infernal spirits.

Thus he had to be vigilant, alert, and active. Sloth and laziness induced to vice. Even sleep itself was really a mere concession to the demons¹, and therefore one had to endeavour to limit its power over him as much as possible. As soon as, at early morning, with the break of day, the good spirits had overpowered the demons of night and had begun to exercise their power anew, the pious had also to rise and to go to their daily work. In this they were chiefly assisted by Chanticleer, whose call scared away slumber. It is to this circumstance, I believe that the domestic cock owes the great attention which is paid to it among the Zoroastrians. I shall dwell upon this more fully in my description of the domestic animals.

In the war against vice the divine beings bring succour to men in various ways. This succour they grant as a mighty weapon through which man can avert and annihilate the destructive influence of the demons². Such is the Holy Word which Mazda has revealed to Zarathushtra; such are the prayers which he has taught him.

The conception of the nature of prayer seems to us rather an extrinsic one. It is not [*always*] the internal elevation of man towards God, nor the degree of devotion and fervency, which makes it efficacious. To the words themselves belongs mysterious, one might almost say, magical power; the mere recitation of them, if correct and faultless, brings that power into action.

These prayers are not to be recited merely on particular occasions; they do not secure help and deliverance in times of imminent danger and difficulty alone. As the demoniacal powers are constantly lurking in ambush to do injury unto men, it is commanded to say prayers, even as a sort of preservative regularly at fixed hours of the day, and in all constantly-recurring occupation and actions.

For the modern Parsees the precise forms of prayer are strictly laid down; a brief survey of them will be sufficient.³

On rising, washing, and dressing, especially on tying the sacred string, a series of prayers are to be repeated. Next follows the special morning-prayer. Before and after each meal, likewise, prayers are said; and in the evening,

¹ Comp. however Vsp. VII, 3.

² Thus it is said of Zarathushtra that he by means of the prayer *Yathā-ahū.vairya* frightened away the demons who, having plotted his ruin, had surrounded him (Vd. XIX, 2). Zarathushtra exultingly says further on: '(I will conquer) by means of the (sacred) mortar, and the cup and the *hauma*, and by the prayer (*vacha*) taught to me by Mazda. My weapon is the *Vahishtem-prayer*; with this I will conquer and frighten away the demons. This weapon is an excellent one, O thou profligate Angra Manyu!' Vd. XIX, 9.

³ Spiegel, *Av. üb.* Vol. II, p. 1. seq.

before the Parsee goes to sleep, he has, further, to reflect upon and examine what he has done in the course of the day, and then only, after reciting certain prayers, he retires to rest.

To the prayers, which form part of the order of the day, are further added a number of others which must be said on certain occurrences, viz. after sneezing, after connubial intercourse, after satisfying natural purposes, after pollutions during sleep, after the cutting of nails and hair, as well as after the lighting of candles.

Several of these cases are anticipated in the Avesta¹, and if others are not mentioned, it may be owing perhaps to the incompleteness of the text. Besides these, prayers are naturally also prescribed for the different ceremonies of purification. They should be repeated, according to circumstances, twice, thrice, four times, or even oftener, and must alternate with the recitation of strophes or sayings from the Gāthās². For deceased relations also, and all relatives, near and distant, it is a solemn obligation to say prayers and to recite the sacred hymns³.

There are, on the whole, four prayers which can be adapted to the most diverse occasions. Three of these are composed in the antique dialect of the Gāthās, the fourth, the prayer *Yējhe-hālām*, shows the same language as the later Avesta. The prayer *Airyema ishyō* is of subordinate importance, whilst the efficacy of the two others is commended in the Avesta in inspired words. Unfortunately the text is extremely difficult and obscure, so that none of the attempts hitherto made to interpret it can be considered as perfectly satisfactory⁴.

The prayer *Ashem vōhū* is translated by Haug in the following manner:—

‘Righteousness is the best good ;

A blessing it is ; a blessing be to him

Who is righteous towards *Asha-vahishta*.’

Its meaning is praised in the Hādokht-Nusk⁵. All that is good and excellent is comprised in it, and all other prayers, are, so to say, included in it. But foremost amongst all the forms of prayer is the *Ahuna-varya*, or, as it is called by the Parsees, the *Honover* :

‘Just as a heavenly lord is to be chosen,

So is an earthly master for the sake of righteousness,

As a giver of good thoughts, and of the actions of life towards Mazda.

The dominion belongs to the lord whom he has appointed as a protector for the poor.’

¹ Vd. XVIII, 43 and 49 ; XVII ; vide Dunker, *GdA.* iv, pp. 158-159.

² Vd. VIII, 19 ; XI and XII ; XIX, 22.

³ Vd. XII.

⁴ Spiegel, *Comm.* vol. ii, p. 466 seq. ; Haugh and West ‘Essays on the Parseis,’ p. 141, note 2. The text is found in Bartholomä, *Gāthās*, pp. 65-66. Comp. now also Roth, *ZddmG.* XXXVIII, p. 437.

⁵ In Westergaard, *Yt.* XXI, note ; Haug and West, ‘Essays,’ p. 218 seq.

Regarding this prayer it is said that Ahura Mazda first uttered it, and that it existed before the heavens, before the water, before the earth, before the animals, the plants and mankind¹. One should recite it without any omission, and not intermix it with anything foreign, if it is meant to have its full effect. Whoever recites it in the manner prescribed, his soul crosses over the bridge which separates this world from the next, and reaches the highest paradise, the most brilliant stars.

The *Honover* is the prayer that ever has been and ever will be spoken. As long as the earth exists it must be recited, and it will protect from death him who says it and who remembers it.

Lastly, it is expressly declared in another passage that this prayer, which had the Highest God for its author, was also recited by the prophet Zarathushtra :

‘ Renowned in the country of Aryana Vajra hast thou first, O Zarathushtra, said four times the *Ahunavarya*, dividing it into verses².’

Besides prayers, sacrifices and offerings may also be noticed here. But as these were only of a private nature, offered only in the rarest cases, and conducted mostly by priests, they will be discussed hereafter.

On the other hand, I must here mention the tending of the hearth-fire, as this was undoubtedly the daily and constant duty of every master of a house, and consequently belonged to household customs in the proper sense of the word.

With the employment of fire begins the civilization of mankind, and this beneficent element the use of which, like speech and reason, distinguishes men from beasts, enjoys on that account divine veneration everywhere on our globe. To the Avesta people, however, it is something more than the mere foundation of civilized life. With them it is at the same time the holiest and the purest element, the reflection of their Highest Deity, Ahura Mazda. It is moreover the symbol of moral purity, and a strong weapon of defence against the demons. During night and darkness, when the wicked demons are at their work, fire produces light and brightness, and frightens away these hellish spirits.

Fire is directly called *Ahurahē Mazdāo puthra*³, ‘ the son of Ahura Mazda’; he is His earthly image, of the same nature and essence with Himself. He is a genius who, after the creation was completed, first spontaneously descended upon the earth in order to protect the creatures devoted to Mazda against the powers of evil⁴. This is proved by the fact that Asha-vahishta, the genius of

¹ Ys. XIX ; Haug and West, ‘ Essays,’ p. 185 seq.

² Ys. IX, 14 ; cf. Haug and West, ‘ Essays,’ p. 179. In my *Handbuch* I have wrongly interpreted the epithet *vīberethwat* ; it is certainly derived from root *bar*=Skr. *bhar bhrñāti*, N.P. *burīdan*. Comp. also Geldner, *Metrik*, p. 127 ; ‘ four times with the transposition of parts.’

³ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. ii, p. 41 seq.

⁴ Vide Spiegel, *Traditionelle Literatur der Parsen*, p. 332.

'the best piety,' is at the same time the genius of fire. Hence also the hearth-fire, as the centre of the house, is the symbol of a fixed settlement; and the latter, on the other hand, is the characteristic or token that distinguishes the righteous and faithful from the impious.

The worship of the hearth-fire amongst the Indo-Germans deserves a succinct description. Amongst the Irānians it is called *nmānō-paiti*, 'the master of the house,' amongst the Indians, *grhapati*, which means the same thing. With the Greeks and Romans also it is the centre of their family-life. Round the *ἑστία* the consecrated hearth, assemble the family on the Apaturian and Amphidromian festivals. The *pater-familias* or the *mater-familias* looks after the cult. All libations that are offered begin with the *Hestia*.

Near the hearth of a Roman house stand the images of the Lares and Penates. The marriage-ceremony is performed near it, as was customary among the old Indians. The young couple are received at the entrance into the new house with the fire of its altar. Near the hearth is placed the nuptial couch.

Similarly, in the house of the old German an everburning fire blazed on the hearth, as an emblem of the everlasting duration of his family and his race. Round about this fire stood the images of the household gods carved in wood. It was the centre of the family worship. A remnant of this old custom survives still in the sports of children.

The mighty Fire which is useful to the pious in a multitude of ways, but which annihilates the vicious in the form of deadly flashes of lightning, is commended in the Gāthās :

'After Thy Fire, O Ahura, the powerful, do we yearn in a pious manner,
After the swift, mighty that rejoices the creation, and lends manifold
assistance,

But which, O Mazda, works the destruction of the enemy through the
bolts of his hands¹.'

From the smoke and the flame of Fire it was believed that the Will of the Deity could be recognized. His crackling flame was the means whereby He spoke to men. In doubtful cases especially the oracular decision of Fire appears to have been often invoked².

The hearth-fire, however, must also be preserved and tended by men. According to a certainly very ancient idea, it must at no time, not even in the night, be extinguished. It must continually blaze and shine as a never-resting champion against demons. When the bright flame becomes extinct, the good spirits, who protect the house from the terrors and dangers of darkness, disappear from it.

The fuel must be dried before it is used³, in order not to contain any moisture which would cause the two elements, water and fire, to clash. Moreover,

¹ Xs. XXXIV, 4.

² Ys. XXXI, 3 and 19. Cf. further *infra*.

³ Comp. the whole section Vd. XVIII, 18 seq.

the proper kind of wood must be selected, some fragrant species such as *Hadhānaipata*, being most desirable. The bark was probably stripped of the wood before burning¹.

The wood must be carried with clean-washed hands, and this is a duty which is to be fulfilled at the beginning, middle, and end of the night, but particularly at early morning when people rise from their beds with the first crowing of the cock. Otherwise *Āzi*, the demon of want and lust, would cause damage to the fire and it might die out from lack of fuel.

Furthermore, Fire actually shows his gratitude to him who bestows due care upon him. As to the master of the house, he blesses him above all things in his domestic life, allows a goodly number of able sons to grow up, and all that belongs to him to improve in power and importance.

‘ May herds of cattle follow thee and men in numbers !

May a powerful mind and an active soul follow thee !

Mayest thou pass thy life with a merry heart all the days that thou livest !’

‘ This is the benediction of Fire unto him who brings him fuel, dry, picked out at daylight, rightly prepared with the intent of the holy commandment².’

The numerous commandments of purification, which are given by the Avesta for almost all imaginable occurrences, have a direct and important bearing upon the daily life of the Zoroastrian. They are multiplied to such an extent, that the excess of formalities and ceremonies must necessarily choke the deeper sense which underlies them.

The Indians, also, look upon a variety of objects as impure, and believe that their impurity may be transferred by contact to men, who have then to remove it by means of prayers, ablutions, and other similar remedies. But, this idea is among the Irānians of the Avesta carried to its furthest extreme and has consequently, as affecting ordinary life, a still greater importance and meaning. The notions of the Brāhmanical Indians and the Eastern Irānians moreover, exhibit in this respect a striking resemblance even as to details and, indeed, in such a manner that we have a right to regard them as very ancient, and to trace them at least to certain common fundamental aspects, which have been transmitted to us from Arian antiquity.

In the Avesta, *dead bodies* are pre-eminently considered as impure. However, the logic of this view is very sensible and excellent. Impure are only the corpse of originally good and pure beings, and they are so, indeed, on the ground that the party of light has sustained a loss on account of their death.

¹ Ys. LXII, 10; Vd. VIII, 2; Vd. XVIII, 27 (the stripping of the bark is perhaps meant by *yaozhdāta*.) We may compare the statement of Strabo (p. 732), that the Persians offered sacrifice to the fire by laying one over the other pieces of wood without rind. Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien*, p. 295. The fuel is called *aesma*.

² Vd. XVIII, 27 ; cf. also Ys. LXII, 10.

If, on the contrary, a vicious person dies, it must be regarded as a gain ; his dead body cannot therefore exercise any corrupting influence¹.

Thus it is principally the dead bodies of pious human beings and those of particularly holy animals, such as the dog, from which contamination issues. Immediately after death has taken place, the demon of putrefaction² prevails and enters the corpse in the shape of a fly, and therewith the dead body has fallen into the grasp of the evil powers and pollutes whatever comes in contact with it.

The different degrees of pollution are laid down most minutely³. The principal distinction is that made between immediate contamination, when one comes into direct contact with the impure object itself, and the indirect pollution which spreads of itself from a defiled person or thing⁴.

Not only men, but beasts also, may be polluted ; and even utensils, particularly those which are used in religious ceremonies, clothes, etc.

Water is impure when a dead body has been rotting in it, or when it has been poured upon a carcass ; the roads upon which corpses are conveyed also become impure, and so do houses in which anybody has died ; in fact, any piece of land upon which a dead body has lain.

Above all, the holiest element, fire, was naturally most exposed to defilement, and it had to be therefore preserved with great care, so that it might not come into contact with anything impure. It is always water or fire which must be taken to a safe place when a death or similar occurrence of polluting influence takes place.⁵

Even by its employment in daily life, more particularly by its application to industrial purposes, fire became unhallowed, according to the notions of the Avesta. Hence it had to be purified from time to time, and to be brought back to the 'lawful place,' the holy fire-altar of the community, and by fetching thence a fresh brand wherewith to revive the fire of the home-hearth⁶.

Here also we come across the traces of a very ancient fire-cult. Analogies of the most striking kind to this custom of the Avesta people are to be found among the Greeks and Germans.

In Lemnos, the most holy centre of the worship of Hephaestus, it was a custom annually to extinguish for several days all the fires in the whole island.

¹ Thus it is said in Vd. V, 36 ; 'Living a destructive, evil person, as for example an *ashemaugha*, directly or indirectly causes pollution to the creatures of the blissful spirit, O son of Spitama, Zarathushtra ; living he smites the water, extinguishes the fire and carries away the cattle ; living he inflicts upon the pious man such a wound as robs him of his life or disfigures his body . . . but not [so when] dead.'

² *Druj-nasush*.

³ Comp. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 693 seq ; vide Vd. V, 27 seq. and the remarks in my *Hdb.* pp. 85-86. Duncker, *GdA.* IV, pp. 161-162.

⁴ *Hām-raethura* and *paiti-raethwa*.

⁵ Comp. Vd. VIII, 73 seq., upon the treatment of the fire with which a corpse was burnt ; Vd. V, 39 seq. ; XVI, 1 seq.

⁶ Vd. VIII, 82 seq.

A sacred ship then brought from the altar at Delos a fire-brand with which fresh hearth-fires were kindled throughout the island amid the loud rejoicings of the people.

In Germany also, there existed until modern times in several districts (as in the country of Marburg and in Lower Saxony) the custom, manifestly descended from the heathens, of extinguishing now and then all the hearth-fires. By rubbing a piece of wood on a wheel, that is, in the old solemn manner, fresh fire was then kindled, from which everybody ignited his own piece of wood and carried it home.¹

The common fundamental idea of this custom amongst the Irānians, Greeks, and Germans, is that the fire in daily use, communicated from one log to another, must have lost in purity through the service of men in course of time, and had therefore to be restored and renewed by fresh fire, the pure, celestial, and still unpolluted element.

The pollution of men, clothes, implements and such like, had to be removed by washing with water and cow's urine. The latter is regarded also by the Indian as miraculously efficacious, and is frequently prescribed in the code of Manu as a means of purification.²

Besides such ablutions, rubbing with earth and fumigation are employed. The latter remedy is used, besides the recitation of sacred *māthras* (sayings) for the purification of dwellings³

The fire had to be conveyed outside the house polluted by the death of an inmate, and it could only be brought back after the lapse of a month during summer, or of nine days during winter⁴.

Defiled land had to lie fallow, defiled water had to be baled out and thrown away. Roads, after a dog had been led over them, had to be reconsecrated by the priest reciting certain prescribed prayers.⁵

The purification of vessels was to be repeated the oftener the more valueless the material was of which they were made. Vessels of lead and wood, when even once polluted, remained impure for ever⁶.

Nor do only dead bodies cause pollution. According to the view of the Avesta, women after child birth are likewise unclean. Among the modern Persians the period of forty days is fixed for a woman lying-in, and during that time she must remain apart from her husband. Analogous to this are also the precepts current among the Parsees of Bombay. The woman is brought to the ground-floor of the house before her delivery. After the child is born, she remains in the same place for forty days. It is only after the lapse of this term, and after performing ablutions with cow's urine and water, that she can

¹ With this comp. A. Kuhn, *Die Herabkunft des Feuers*.

² Manu, V, 59 seq. ; for particulars *vide* Duncker, *GdA.* IV, p. 128 seq.

³ Vd. VIII, 2 ; XII ; IX, 32 and XIX, 24 (with this comp. my *Hdb.* p. 107);

⁴ Vd. V, 30 seq.

⁵ Vd. VI, 1 seq. ; VI, 33 seq. ; VIII, 14 seq.

⁶ Vd. VII, 73 seq.

again associate with other members of her family, and devote herself to her husband¹.

The Mosaic law determines a period of thirty-three days after the birth of a boy, and of sixty-six days after that of a girl during which time the woman who has been confined is regarded as unclean, and remains within doors². . . .

During their menses also women are impure, and to a certain extent in the power of evil. They are unclean, and impart pollution to objects and persons surrounding them. Consequently they are lodged during that time in a special place, where they remain perfectly secluded from all that could be exposed to defilement.

Their place shall be covered up with dry dust, and be cleared of all plants and weeds : it shall be situated higher than the surface of the rest of the house, so that the eye of the woman may not fall on the hearth-fire and defile it. Fifteen steps distant must that place be from the sacred elements, water and fire, as well as from the sacred chattels used in offerings ; and only as far as three steps distant can pious men approach it.

Even now in [a few] Parsee houses such a resting-place is found for unclean women, which is called *Deshānistān*. It is an apartment void of every comfort, and from which one can neither perceive the sun, nor the moon, nor the stars, neither fire nor water, nor sacred vessels, much less any men³.

Three days were regarded as the normal period of menstruation, and the ninth day was its utmost limit. If it continued still longer, it was the work of the demons, an appearance of sickness. Under ordinary circumstance the isolation of the woman continued for four days, and only after fitting ablutions could she return amongst other people⁴.

In modern Persia it is enjoined that women should refrain in such cases seven or eight days long from bathing and from holding any intercourse with their husbands. The Mosaic law prescribes a separation of seven days, during which time women are unclean and are forbidden to men⁵.

Of course the Avesta likewise forbids men conjugal intercourse with their wives during their courses ; the infringement of this prohibition seems to have been at first considered even as an inextinguishable sin. Later on a milder view was taken of it, for another penalty, though indeed a very high one, was set upon it. If the guilty one avoided the punishment, he was regarded as one damned, and was abandoned to the infernal powers.⁶

1 Polak, *Persien*, i, p. 220 ; Dossabhoy Framjee, 'The Parsees,' p. 63.

2 *Leviticus*, XII, 4 seq.

3 West, 'Pahlavi Texts,' part i, p. 277, note 4. Very detailed statements regarding the treatment of menstruating women are contained in the Tract *Shāyast-lā-Shāyast* chap. 3.

4 The statement essentially rests on the beginning of Vd. XVI, where the management of a *nāirika-chithravaiti*, *dakhshtavaiti*, *vohunavaiti* is discussed . . .

5 Polak, *Persien*, i, p. 203 ; *Lev.* XV, 19.

6 The idea in Vd. XVIII, 67-76 and XVI, 14-16 on the one hand and that in Vd. XVI, 17 on the other seem to contradict each other. We have here probably again to do with two different views of the Vendidad (comp. *Zdārt*, vol. xxxiv, p. 415).

A similar rule of conduct as that for menstruating women is also prescribed by the Avesta for such as have miscarried. These must also be lodged in a separate place, furnished with an enclosuro, and thirty steps distant from fire, water and sacred utensils; the ground being as dry as possible and cleared of plants. People must again remain three steps distant from it. During confinement they receive as food first only milk, then fruits; and later on, after the apse of three days, meat, bread, and *madhu*, but no water¹.

The ceremonies through which impurities were removed were of very different descriptions. Sometimes they consisted in the washing of the head, sometimes in that of the hands and arms, sometimes in that of the entire body². Particular importance was attached to the cleaning of the nine doors or openings of the human body viz., of the eyes, ears, and nostrils, of the mouth, &c., because through them, so to say, the interior of the human being is connected with the exterior world.³

In the higher and more unusual cases of pollution the Zoroastrian could not even undertake to perform the ceremony himself, but had to call in a priest. Particular efficacy was held to belong to the so-called *purification of the nine nights*, which Spiegel has fully described on the basis of the statement contained in the ninth chapter of the Vendidad and of the traditional supplements⁴ :—

‘ For such a purification a barren piece of ground is selected, where there is neither water nor tree, and which is distant from fire and from pure beings. Six holes are then dug in the ground, two fingers deep in summer, four fingers deep in winter, each of them a step distant from the other; afterwards three more holes are dug, which are three steps distant from the six before mentioned. Round these holes twelve circles are drawn, in such a way that three circles surround the three holes, three the six holes, three all nine, and lastly three more surround them all. The defiled person stands near the six holes inside the circles, the priest outside of them. After a short prayer is recited by the priest, and repeated by the polluted one, the latter is besprinkled by the purifier with the urine of the bullock, which is first poured into a vessel (commonly a spoon) that is fastened to a stick containing nine knots; in this way the priest can approach the body of the defiled with the spoon, although he himself stands outside the circles. After the polluted person has cleansed his whole body with the urine, the *Ahuna-varya* is recited, and thereupon the uncleanness or, according to the notion of the Irānians, the demon of uncleanness, leaves the man. The person purified then approaches the other five holes,

1 Vd. V, 45; cf. Geldner, *K.Z.* xxv, pp. 209-210.

2 *Frasnāiti, upasnāiti, usnāiti*, Vd. VIII, 98. Comp. Spiegel, *Av. üb.* vol. ii, p. lxxxv.

3 Vd. V, 54; cf. Geldner, *K. Z.* XXV, p. 209; Vd. III, 14 (*ZddmG.* vol. XXXIV p. 419.)

4 *E.A.* vol. iii, pp. 698-699; (*Av. üb.* vol. ii, p. lxxxv. seq.).

[In connection with the Bareshnūm Ceremony of purification for any Zoroastrian man or woman, it would be very interesting to read Dr. West's elaborate description of the same, given in his 'Pahlavi Texts,' part ii, pp. 431-454. *Tr.*]

at each of which the priest recites the *Ahuna-varya* anew ; near the sixth hole he rubs himself fifteen times with earth, and washes himself afterwards with water near the remaining three holes. After this he has still to wait for nine nights, and to wash himself every third night : then only is he again fit to associate with other people.

§ 10. *Death and Disposal of the Body.*

DEATH is regarded in the Avesta as a separation of the body and the soul¹, as an analysis of the two constituent parts of man, of the perishable matter, and the immortal everlasting force which had made her abode in the body during life. The activity of the soul of man manifests itself according to different tendencies and in different spheres. Consequently the Avesta assumes the existence of several faculties of the soul, which, dissimilar in their nature and mode of operation, reside in the human body. We shall later on make it our business to express our thoughts on the Avesta doctrine of the soul. At present it will suffice to prove that the soul and the vital power are not identical ; through the decay of the latter the soul is forced to quit the body.

When death takes place, the soul does not at once depart entirely from the body to which it once belonged, but still remains for three days and three nights in its vicinity². Death is, therefore, a kind of transitional stage, during which, however, the soul experiences a foretaste of the fate that awaits it. The soul of the pious man already feels the delights and joys of Paradise, but that of the impious man the anguish and torments of Hell.

The body of the deceased Mazdayasna falls a prey to the powers of evil as soon as the soul has vanished from it ; yea its activity has ceased. It can never subdue and impair the kingdom of Angra Manyu. The demons rejoice over its death. From the Northern regions which are considered by the Eastern Irānian to be the abode of everything evil—where the waterless barren deserts extend, where the burning winds of summer and the snow-storms of winter blow, where hostile tribes dwell—comes the ghost of the corpse, the frightful *Druj-Nasush*.³ It takes possession of the corpse in the shape of a fly, probably because on every corpse are to be seen flies—in themselves loathsome and impure creatures. It has its chief seat in the nose, the eyes, the tongue, the jaw-bones—here by metonymy used for ears,—the sexual organs, the *clunes*,—that is at the doors of the body,—which always appear subject to pollution to a particular extent⁴.

¹ *Astascha·baodhaghhascha·vi-urvishiti*, Vd. VIII, 81 ; XIX, 7. Designations for 'body' are, besides *asti*, the rather irregular *azdēbīsh* (?skeleton), *ushtāna* ('form outward appearance,' comp. Geldner, K.Z. xxv, p. 309, note 1), and *kehrp*. Ys. LV, 1.

² *Urvan* ; this includes the moral and intellectual power of man (*urvan* and *baodhagh*) as well as the guardian spirit (*fravashi*) accompanying it during life. With this description comp. Yt. XXII ; next Haug and West, 'Essays,' p. 219 seq.

³ Vd. VII, 2 [so to say, the wind of putrefaction].

⁴ Vd. III, 14 ; IX, 40. Comp. *supra*, p. 82.

From the dead body the impurity spreads itself further in the house in which the corpse lies, and to everything that is in it. It communicates itself to survivors and relations, and does so the more the nearer they have stood in relationship to the dead. There now begin a series of ceremonies, which I have already described, for the purpose of washing away the pollution.

But the most peculiar ceremony, which is performed on the dead body itself before its disposal, is the *SAGDĪD*. I here confine myself to the most essential points, since this subject has been before fully and frequently treated¹.

The ceremony consists in leading a dog towards the deceased, so that his eyes may fall on the corpse. I may here mention that they ascribe to the glance of a dog the power of scaring away the Evil Being. With the same view evidently a dog is conducted over the way by which a deceased person has been carried, in order to make it again accessible for men and beasts.

The dog to be employed for the *Sagdid* must have certain special marks : he must be four-eyed—this I shall explain further on—he must be of a yellow colour or white with yellow ears.²

A very ancient popular idea lies at the root of this entire custom, the knowledge of which, however, was wholly lost even to the Avesta people³. According to the old Indian legend, Yama, the god of death, has two dogs who follow him. They guard the path leading into the next world, and alarm and frighten the souls wandering therein. Or, like a hunter, Yama sends forth the dogs as his messengers, to bring home the souls who have fallen into his power.

In a funeral song of the Rig-veda they call out, therefore, to the deceased :

‘Run straight past the two dogs of Saramā, the four-eyed, parti-coloured.’

¹ The word comes from N.P. *sag* ‘dog’ + *did* from the infinitive *didan*, from rt. *di* ‘to see.’ Vide the commandments of the Parsee tradition respecting this custom in *Pahlavi-Vendidad*, III, 48 ; and in *Shāyast-la-Shāyast*, II, 1-3 (West, ‘Pahlavi Texts. part i, pp. 245-246) ; comp. further Spiegel, *Av. üb.* vol. ii, p. xxxii, seq. ; *ibid.* E.A. vol. iii, 701 ; seq. ; Dossabhoy Framjee, ‘The Parsees,’ p. 93 seq.

² *Spānem zairilem chathru chashmem spaetem zairi-gaoshem*, Vd. VIII, 16.

³ [We cannot see how the Avesta people could have been ignorant of this oriental idea regarding the power of the spiritual dogs on the Chinvat Bridge, or of what is already alluded to in the passage (Vd. XIII, 9), where the soul (*urva*) of the deceased person is represented as being (on the morning of the fourth day after death) accompanied by his conscience (*daena*, i.e., the consciousness of his own good or bad actions), together with the two spiritual dogs (i.e., spiritual confidence and watchfulness over one’s self), called in the Avesta *peshu-pāna*, or ‘(the dogs) that guard the bridge.’ Their work is to preserve the soul, during its passage, from any evil influence of the hellish fiends (probably distrust in one’s own moral behaviour), which are supposed to be haunting the Bridge of Judgment in order to drag away the pious soul into hell. We would rather presume that the old Irānian notion regarding the *Sagdid*, as scaring away any evil influence, is quite in accordance with their conception of the *peshu-pāna* dogs. By the commandment of the *Sagdid* and the exposition of its influence produced directly upon a dead body the Avesta introduces, so to say, a new element in the useful characteristics of the dog’s eye, viz., its magnetic power in checking the contagious impurity of a corpse. Comp. Haug and West, ‘Essays,’ p. 240 note 1. Tr.]

Or the departed ones are recommended to the protection of the two dogs in order that they may conduct them safely to the shades :

‘ Those are thy watchers, O Yama, the two dogs,
The four-eyed, the path-watching, men-contemplating,
To them surrender this dead, O king,
And grant him safety and freedom from pain !’

To this is then added the wish that he may himself be spared from the dismal companions :

‘ The two broad-nosed, soul-robbing, brown
Messengers of Yama wander among men ;
Those shall, to contemplate the sun,
Grant us once again a happy life !’¹

In order to prove the high antiquity of this myth, I shall here only mention the guard at the gate of Hades, the hell-hound Kerberos or the dog Garm, who, according to the narrative of Edda, raises his howling at the breaking of the twilight of the gods in the depth of the Genupa Hollow².

If, therefore, in old Irān a dog was conducted towards the dead body, it was, originally, only intended thereby to indicate in a symbolical way, that the soul of the deceased was given over to the god of death and his followers and was at the same time recommended to their protection. The myth itself, in conformity with the unvarying character of the Avesta religion, was forgotten in course of time, but the ceremony was firmly adhered to, and the once very ingenious custom sank into an empty unintelligible form which has survived to the present day amongst the latest adherents of the Zoroastrian doctrine³.

It is highly characteristic, how the epithet ‘ four-eyed ’ was explained in a sober rationalistic manner. Originally, in the poetical language of the myth, the great watchfulness of the dog was chiefly to be emphasized. Hence the precept was construed to mean that the dogs employed for the *Saydīd* must have two black spots over their eyes that the ceremony might be efficacious⁴.

After the performance of the *Saydīd*, for which the tradition naturally gives the most detailed casuistic rules of direction, the dead body was disposed of. The disposal neither consisted in burying nor in burning, but, according to the Zoroastrian ritual, in exposing the corpse on a lonely place to be eaten by birds, dogs, and ravenous animals.

¹ Rig-veda X, 14, 10-12. Comp. Max Müller, ‘ Lectures on the Science of Language,’ vol. ii, p. 435 seq. : Kaegi, *Der Rig-veda*, pp. 59-60, particularly note 337.

² *Völuspā*, 48.

³ [Vide the translator’s note 2 on the preceding page.]

⁴ In Vd. XIII, 9 the dog is also called *peshu-pāna* ‘ guarding the bridge, the passage (to the next world),’ which reminds us of the *ṣvānau pathīrakshī* in the Rig-veda ; *chathur-akṣa* is identical with *chathru-chashma* (Kuhn in Haupt’s *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* vol. vi, p. 125 ; Weber’s *Indische Studien*, vol. ii, p. 296 ; vide Justi, *Hdb.* s. v.)

Herodotus relates that this mode of disposing of the dead was common amongst the Magi, that is, amongst the Persian priesthood. Strabo mentions it in connection with the Hyrcanians, and Cicero expressly distinguishes between the funeral customs of the Magi and those of the Persian nation¹.

Among Westerns that remarkable injunction of the Avesta regarding the treatment of the dead, which appears to us so unnatural, was also well-known. But there is no doubt that it never found acceptance throughout the whole of Irān, but was possibly confined to the North-Eastern districts and, moreover, entirely to the priesthood. The Avesta itself informs us that in *Chakhra*, that is, somewhere in the district of Meshed, the dead were burnt, and that in *Harahvati*, where people do not seem to have very strictly adhered to the Zoroastrian commandments, they were interred².

The exposure of the dead owed its origin, as it appears, to the natural condition of Eastern Irān. The waste lands immediately adjoining its border were themselves comparable to a gigantic grave. They to a great extent suggested the idea of conveying the dead thither and abandoning them to their fate. Besides, people were also compelled to do so, when anybody—and this was certainly not rare—lost his life in longer or shorter wanderings through the sand and salt-steppes.

We must also add that, considered from a strictly logical stand-point, the burning as well as the burial of the dead contravenes the whole idea, respecting the world, of the Avesta and its followers. Through both, the impure corpse, which has fallen a prey to the demons, comes in contact with the essentially sacred and pure elements, with fire and earth. Such a pollution however was to be avoided under all circumstances.

The exposure of the dead body was certainly an old custom which, though perhaps not in general use amongst the kindred Indians, was nevertheless now and then put in practice in all urgent cases. The Atharva-veda seems to us to bear witness to this fact. It distinguishes between the *mutnes* of such as were buried, thrown aside, burnt or exposed. We may believe that it here enumerates the different modes of disposing of the dead, with which it was familiar and which it considered to be lawful³.

Here everybody will naturally be reminded of the Kāfirs, a very remarkable nation inhabiting the high mountain-valleys of the Hindukush, which are difficult of access and situated on the North of Cabul. With them it is a general custom to expose the dead, without interring them, in deal chests

¹ Spiegel, *R.A.* vol. iii, pp. 703-704.

² Vd. I, 17 (*nasushpachya* 'the burning of the dead,') and 13 (*nasushpaya* 'the burying of the dead').

³ Atharva-veda XVII, 2, 34. The expressions are: *nikhūta*, *paropta* (from *rt. vap + parā*), *dagdha*, *uldhita*. Comp. Zimmer, *Alt.* p. 402. We have observed that in the Avesta *uzhdāna* indeed also designated the scaffold erected for the exposure of the corpse (*Hdb.* s. v.).

on the summits of mountains, that is, on the most elevated points¹. If we further consider what an implacable hatred the Kāfirs cherish against the followers of Islam, and how they have been able to preserve their freedom and independence, especially in the exercise of their religion, in spite of all the efforts of their enemies, that remarkable custom might lead us to recognize in the Kāfirs descendants of the old Zoroastrians. It must, however, be taken into consideration here that, according to the 'Inquiries' of Trumpp, the Kāfirs speak an absolutely Indian language. At all events we shall have to wait for still fuller and surer accounts before we can form a definite opinion regarding that nation.

In the exposure of the dead, we have, therefore, to deal with a custom which, due to local circumstances, was most probably occasionally practical before the introduction of the Zoroastrian Reform. As that custom completely corresponded to the spirit of the reform, it was accepted by its originators and laid down as a generally binding precept. But that, previous to the burning of corpses, this custom was most widely spread amongst the Indians is strikingly proved by the linguistic usage concerning it.

The place which is destined for exposure bears the name of DAKHMA. This word originally meant, as clearly appears from its derivation, nothing else than the place for burning².

The *dakhmas* must be erected on places situated on high, on the tops of hills or slopes. Dogs and wolves, foxes and ravenous birds can thus easily perceive the corpse there laid down and seize their prey. The so-called Towers of Silence, which serve the Parsees in Bombay as places for the disposal of their dead, crown the summit of the magnificent Malabar Hill which rises above the city. The view which they present is naturally most gloomy. A body of lazy vultures, densely crowded, guard the edge of the Tower. There they sit immovable and motionless, save when a funeral procession approaches and the flock are filled with excitement. They fly upwards with screams, and as soon as the dead body is laid within by the bearers, they throw themselves with greedy haste upon their prey. In a few minutes the dreadful work is finished, and the birds return satiated to their place to wait for fresh food.

Originally, the *dakhmas* were certainly nothing more than natural hills or primitive elevations of sand, earth, or stones. In course of time the structure became a more elaborate one. It is a rule that the *dakhma* must be uncovered and exposed to the solar rays as well as to the rain³.

¹ Masson, 'Narrative,' vol. i, p. 224: 'It is agreed that the Siāposh place their corpses in deal boxes and, without interring them, expose them on the summits of hills.' Comp. Elphinstone, 'Kabul,' vol. ii, pp. 336-337; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 398.

² *Dakhma* comes from rt. *daz*=Skr. *dah* 'to burn.' [Others derive it from rt. *dak*=Skr. *damṣ*=Gr. *δακ* 'to bite'. Hence it may originally mean the place where dead bodies are consumed either by insects (in the grave), or by vultures (on the tower). *Tr.*]

³ Hence the expression *hvarē-darcsīm.kar* 'cause that (the corpse) is looked at by the sun,' quite synonymously with 'expose the dead.'

Nor are all places suitable for the erection of *dakhmas*. Wastes and unproductive pieces of land are the most fit, for they belong already to the evil powers and are the abode of demons. But the Mazdayasna lives in a constant struggle with the desert lands themselves. Plough and hoe are the weapons with which he takes the field against them, and tries to make the land, which was before sterile, piece by piece, arable and available for 'the good creation'. Thus many *dakhmas* had to be pulled down and re-erected further off, when civilization had approached them. This explains why the closing of *dakhmas* is esteemed meritorious¹. It is a token that another piece of land has been wrung from the evil spirits through human labour and exertion. Close to the *dakhmas* wild animals are on the watch; there dwell ghosts and demons that rejoice in death and destruction; there also as the Irānian very well knew, are the breeding places of manifold maladies and pestilential diseases².

The corpse, which is exposed, is laid, as it seems, on a special layer of mortar or similar material³. There it remains, according to the expression of the Avesta, until it is mixed with the dust, until its fatty and fleshy parts have disappeared⁴. The birds and beasts should only gnaw the flesh from the bones, the skeleton, on the contrary, remaining uninjured and complete and for this reason the dead in the *dakhma* are weighted near the head and feet with iron chains or stones or wooden blocks. Were this not done, a wolf

¹ Vd. III, 9 and 13; VII, 51.

² Vd. VII, 58. [How Dr. Geiger could conceive this totally new aspect of the meritoriousness of pulling down the *dakhmas*, we cannot imagine. The word as it is used throughout the Avesta (Vd. III, 9, 13; V, 14, 16, 18, 51; VII, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 58; VIII, 2 &c.) does not mean the place for the exposure of the Irānian dead but the covered tomb of any person, be he Zoroastrian or non-Zoroastrian. As the Vendidad strictly orders the exposure of the dead body to the light of the sun, its consumption by vultures and the preservation of its bones in an *astodān*, so also does it forbid closed sepulchres to the adherents of the Law, while it compels them to pull down and destroy any tomb whereby to restore, as science has taught us but lately, the natural purity of Mother Earth, upon whom solely depends the subsistence of the animal creation. To what extent the Irānian system of exposing the dead is more beneficial to life than the practice of interment, we do not here discuss; suffice it to listen to the remarks of Prof. Monier Williams in his 'Modern India and the Indians':

'When the Secretary had finished his defence of the Towers of Silence, I could not help thinking that however much such a system may shock our European feelings and ideas, yet our own method of interment, if regarded from a Parsi point of view, may possibly be equally revolting to Parsi sensibilities.

'The exposure of the decaying body to the assaults of innumerable worms may have no terrors for us; but let it be borne in mind that neither are the Parsi survivors permitted to look at the swoop of the heaven-sent birds. Why, then, should we be surprised if they prefer the more rapid to the more lingering operation? and which of the two systems they may reasonably ask, is more defensible on sanitary grounds? *Vide* p. 88-89 *Tr.*]

³ I translate the difficult passage, Vd. VIII, 10, thus: 'Then shall two men, as strong and skilful as possible, bring it (the corpse) near naked and unclad, and shall lay it down upon a pile of clay or stone or upon a wooden scaffold [rather cement] (by which the *dakhma* is naturally meant) in mortar upon the earth.'

⁴ Vd. VII, 49.

or a vulture could remove portions of the dead body, and with them pollute water and plants¹.

The skeleton requires peculiar treatment. After a certain time it is removed from the *dakhma* and brought to a place where beasts cannot enter, and where it is no longer exposed to the rain². A detailed description of the charnel-house is wanting in the Avesta. The modern Parsees cause the *dakhma* to be cleaned twice every year, on which occasion the bones are thrown through a large opening in the middle of its surface, into the interior of the tower³. It is possible that in ancient times also an excavation was left open in the *dakhma* as a receptacle for bones. It may however be also assumed that originally the ossuary was altogether separate from the place of exposure. The skeleton also was deposited on a base of stone or mortar or on carpets. In case that could not be done, common coverings or mats, such as those which were then used for sitting and resting upon, would suffice.

The diverse mode of treatment of the whole body and of the bones remaining is grounded probably on the notion that the impurity of the corpse attaches itself above all to its perishable parts, and that, therefore, the latter must be subjected to an annihilation as speedy as possible, while the bones meet with a worthier treatment. This custom corresponds in a striking way with a statement of Justin respecting the Parthians, that they abandoned their dead to the birds and dogs, but interred the bones when stripped of the flesh⁴.

It was ordered in the Avesta to convey the dead only in fine and clear weather to the *dakhma*. The sun should shine over them in their last journey, perhaps in accordance with the old popular idea, which compares the dying of the man with the setting of the sun in the West. In case dark and inclement weather prevailed, the exposure had to be postponed. In connection with this the Avesta expresses itself as follows :

‘If in the house of a Mazdayasna a man or a dog die, and if it rain, or snow, or storm, or if it be dark or if it be a day, when men and animals are prevented from going out, what shall the Mazdayasna do?’

It is then prescribed, that for such cases there shall be in each village and on each farm three *katas*, ‘pits or cavities.’ They must be situated in a place cleared of all plants and entirely dry, where neither men nor animals pass,

1 Vd. VI, 46. The passage Vd. V, 3-4, only apparently militates against such an idea, for it only brings out prominently that the *man* does not become polluted by the carcass having been dragged away by dogs, wolves, birds, winds, or flies; here, on the contrary, the question is one respecting the contamination of water and plants.

2 With the whole section compare the beginning of Vd. VIII, as well as Vd. VI, 44-46, 49-50. The two-fold treatment of the whole corpse and of the skeleton in particular, according to my comprehension of the last passage, is illustrated in my *Handbuch* at the foot of page 99.

3 Spiegel, *Ar. üb.* vol. ii, p. lvi.

4 Justin, 41, 3, in Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 704.

and which is a few steps distant from fire and water, from sacred chattels, and from the dwellings of pious men. Such a *kata* serves as a principal receptacle for the dead. It must be of a certain size, so that the corpse may not strike against the sides either above or below. Besides, the bottom must be strewed with sand or brick-dust, probably in order to prevent the corpse from touching the earth, and to keep away all moisture :

‘ Here they shall deposit the lifeless body for two or three nights long, for a month, until the birds fly again and the plants germinate, until the waters run again towards the valley and the wind dries the earth. And afterwards, when the birds fly again and the plants grow, when the waters flow again towards the valley and the wind dries the earth then the Mazdayasna shall (bring the dead body to the *dakhma* and) expose it to the sun¹.’

If any contact whatever with a corpse caused pollution, such pollution must have fallen to a great degree upon the people who carried the dead to the *dakhma*. Hence this work was in ancient as well as in modern times performed not by the survivors, but by corpse-bearers, specially appointed for that purpose², whose profession was generally held in abhorrence, its representatives being excluded from human society*

Never can one man alone bear a corpse, as such an action would render, him polluted for ever, even in the next world. There must always be two, who, after having finished their business must undergo a special purification. This consists in the washing of the head and of the body with the urine of cows (and water)*

The dwelling of the corpse-bearer lies apart from the houses of other men. and nobody holds any intercourse or communion with him. In a barren, waste region does he live, evidently in a kind of a cavern. He is only scantily furnished with food and clothing ; a poor and miserable life shall he lead until his old age*

As soon as the corpse was laid in the *dakhma* and abandoned to wild animals, there was yet a long period of mourning for the survivors. The commandments, originating in a later period concerning the ceremonies which were performed in the name of the dead to honour his memory, I may here conveniently pass over, as they have been collected and treated of before³. Accord-

¹ Vd. VIII, 4-10 ; V, 10-13. Both of the passages treat evidently of the same subject, as it occurs frequently in the Vendidad, though in somewhat different ways. Instead of the detailed description of the weather, which is found in Vd. VIII, we have in Vd. V, only ‘ but when the summer has passed and the winter sets in ; ’ the sense of course is quite the same. In Vd. VIII, the provisional pit is called *kata*, in Vd. V. *avakana* ; there the *dakhma* is called *skemba* ‘ scaffold.’ Comp. also my *Hdb.* p. 81 note 2.

² This statement is based on Vd. III, 14-21 (besides Vd. VIII, 10), with which we should compare *ZddmG.* vol. xxxiv, pp. 419, 420. The corpse-bearer is called *nasukasha* or *iristū-kasha*, by the modern Parsees *nasūsāfār*. Vide Spiegel, *Av. üb.* vol. ii, p. xxxiv ; Dossabhoy Framjee, ‘ The Parsees,’ p. 92.

³ Spiegel, *Av. üb.* vol. ii, p. xxxviii. seq.

ing to the Avesta, the relatives of the deceased had to refrain for a time from all intercourse with men¹. During that time they devoted themselves exclusively to the remembrance of their beloved dead, and sent up their prayers to Ahura Mazda for him and for his eternal salvation.

The soul, however, delivered from the shackles of the body and freed from the clay of this earthly life, was borne up into higher worlds.

11. *Immortality² and Eschatology.*

THE belief in the continuation of existence after death, in a future world into which enter souls leaving their mortal frame, in a judgment and recompense in that world, is found amongst the most diverse nations on our globe, in a form sometimes more and sometimes less distinct and definite.

Among the Indo-Germanic races this belief was evidently deep-rooted, and formed an essential portion of their doctrine.

According to the Rig-veda, the spirits of the dying follow *Father Yama*, the primeval sun-god, into his distant realm, on the path which he has trodden before them. There the '*Fathers*' assemble round him, in order to enjoy convivial feasting in the middle of heaven under the dense foliage of trees :

'Where light is, which never becomes extinct

And where the heavenly radiance glitters,

There, into the immortality,

The eternal, carry me, Soma !

Where king is Vaivasvata

And where the innermost region of heaven is,

¹ Vd. XII. Comp. above all Darmesteter's *Vondidād*, introduction to that chapter.

² ['Next to the being of a God, the doctrine of the Immortality of Man lies at the foundation of all religion, and of all the animating prospects which can cheer us in the land of our pilgrimage. Remove from the mind the belief of a future existence and the hope of immortality, and religion becomes a shadow, life a dream, and the approach of death a scene of darkness and despair. Upon this short question, "*Is man immortal, or is he not?*" depends all that is valuable in science, in morals, and in theology ; and all that is most interesting to man as a social being, and as a rational and accountable intelligence. If he is destined to an eternal existence, an immense importance must attach to all his present affections, actions, and pursuits ; and it must be a matter of infinite moment, that they be directed in such a channel as will tend to carry him forward in safety to the felicities of a future world. But if this whole existence be circumscribed within the circle of a few fleeting years, man appears an enigma, an inexplicable phenomenon in the universe, human life a mystery, the world a scene of confusion, virtue a mere phantom, the Creator a capricious Being, and his plans and arrangements an inextricable maze.

'Since it appears that the desire of immortality is common to mankind, that the soul is incessantly looking forward to the enjoyment of some future good, and that this desire has been the spring of actions the most beneficent and heroic, on what principle is it to be accounted for ?

'Whence springs this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality ?

Or, whence this secret dread, and inward horror,
Of falling into nought ? Why shrinks the soul

Back on herself, and startles at destruction ?'—*Addison*.]

Where those eternal waters are—

O Soma, make me immortal !

‘ Where one, according to wish, stirs or moves,

In the third stage of the kingdom of heaven,

Where all the rooms are resplendent—

O Soma, make me immortal !

‘ Where wish and aspiration are gratified,

At the highest point in the sun’s rotation,

Where desire and gratification exist together,

O Soma, make me immortal !

‘ Where pleasure and mirth and gaiety

And delight reside, where the will

Of the willing is attained—

O Soma, make me immortal !

In the Homeric poems a two-fold conception prevails regarding the next world, which is looked for at the confines of the world, in the remote part of the West, or in the depths of the earth. It is a dismal and foggy land, hateful alike to men and gods, in which the souls of the departed lead a visionary and fantastic life. Besides this, there is also found milder and more agreeable picture of the Elysian fields, where the fair Rhadamanthus reigns, and where there is neither snow, nor storms, nor even showers of rain, but where a cool west wind blowing from the ocean refreshes men. Indeed these blessed fields are at first only the paradise of specially favoured men, who, without undergoing death, are carried thither by the gods². I believe, however, that these descriptions have their foundation in old legends of a more beautiful and better future world. In fact in a later period only *one* Hades is mentioned, in which the good and the bad both find a place, the former in the fields of the blessed, the latter in the space set apart for the damned.

A very striking analogy to the views of the Greeks is presented by those of the old Germans. Those men who perish fighting and remain on the field in the heat of battle are conveyed into the illuminated hall of the *Walhalla*, where they, together with Odin, the war-father, enjoy merry war-games and jovial feasting. However all other men, good and evil, wander into *Hel*, which is represented as a dismal, misty region like the Hades in Homer³.

But nowhere, I think, does the belief in the future life after death stand out more prominently, nowhere are the ideas respecting it expressed more

¹ Rig-veda, IX, 113, 7 seq.; Geldner and Kaegi, *Siebenzig Lieder des Rig-veda*, p. 111; Zimmer *AltL.* p. 408 seq.

² Odyssey, bk. XI, l. 15 seq., l. 155 seq., ll. 474-476, ll. 489-491; Iliad, bk. XXII, l. 482; bk. XX, l. 61 seq.; Od. bk. IV, l. 561 seq.

³ Hence the names *Niflheimr* ‘land of mists’ and *Niflhel* ‘misty hollow.’ Comp. Gylfaginning, p. 49 (Simrock, *Edda ubersetzt*, p. 319); on Walhalla comp. *Grimnismal*, 8, 23; Gylf. 38-41 (idem 15, 303-305).

decidedly and carried out in all their details more fully, than among the Avesta people.

Here the doctrine of immortality and of compensating justice in the next world forms a fundamental dogma of the whole system. Without it the Zoroastrian religion is in fact unintelligible. If all the powers which contend upon earth for the kingdom of light were lost, the conviction of divine justice would have to be abandoned.

So far as we are able to follow up the Mazda doctrine, we find that even in the first period of its foundation, the belief in immortality is strong and active. For who in that age would have fixed his choice upon a new religion if the hope of a better life after death had not been held out to him as the reward of all the troubles and hardships to be endured for its sake ?

Accordingly, the first proclaimers of the Mazda religion in their teaching and preaching speak directly of the next world as being the greatest of all possessions, of the eternal beattitude of the pious, and of the eternal damnation of the impious. The believer belongs to the spiritual world, he shall enter into it ; the corporeal world is only the transitory scene of his activity, his battles, and his trials.

‘ Whosoever in righteousness shows to me
The genuine good actions, to me, who am Zarathustra :
Him may they (the divine beings) grant, as a reward, the next world,
Which is more desirable than all others¹.’
‘ That man may attain the best of all good,
Who exhibits to us the direct path of bliss
In this corporeal world, and in that of the spirit,
Towards the pious people with whom Ahura dwells :
It is he, the Singer, who surrenders himself to Thee,
O Mazda ! Who art wise and blissful² !’

According to the Hellenic belief, the souls wandering in the next world must either pass over the ocean or be allowed to cross over the rivers of the nether regions in the boat of Charon. The northern legends of the Edda make mention of a bridge, the Giocell Bridge, by which the dead enter *Hel*. The people on the western coast of Gaul believed that their dead were carried by mariners over the sea to the foggy and gloomy Britannia.³

1 Ys. XLVI, 19. *Vasnā frashotemem* at the end of the second verse literally means ‘standing in the uppermost place with a wish (a desirableness),’ and refers, I believe, to *parāhum* (vide Haug, *Gāthās*, vol. ii, p. 154 ; Spiegel and C. de Harlez differ). This expression is the same as the otherwise written *purō-asna-aghu*. *Hanenti* may be translated ‘they may grant.’

2 Ys. XLIII, 3. *Vaṅhēush-vahyō* is literally ‘what is better than the good.’ The *hvō-nā* in the beginning is to be taken with *aredrō* of the last verse (vide Haug, *Gāthās*, vol. ii, pp. 65-66).

3 Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, 4, 20 ; vide Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, 24, 694-695.

According to the Rig-veda also the departing soul has to pass immense oceans before it reaches the next world. At one time it is a boat, at other times a bridge, 'the Bridge of Happiness,' by means of which it crosses¹.

On such ideal conceptions also rests the doctrine of the Avesta regarding the *Chinvat Bridge*, more probably 'the Bridge of Retribution,' upon which justice is administered to the departing souls². The bridge was believed, I think, to have been built over a wide expanse of water, which separates Paradise from this world. Only he who is found pious and good before the holy tribunal is entitled to cross this bridge, but the wicked one is thrown into outer darkness and hell.

Thus it is said in the Gāthās :

'What man or what woman, O Ahura Mazda !

Achieves for me in this life the best actions that Thou knowest,

(That bring) blessing for the pious, and power by means of the Good Sense,

And those, whom I call to follow me in your praise :

With all these will I cross over the Chinvat Bridge !'

'But with the princes the idol-worshippers and the false priests unite themselves,

To destroy human life by means of evil deeds.

The former will greatly distress their own souls and their own conscience,

When they arrive there where the Bridge of Retribution is ;

For all eternity do their bodies belong to the habitation of the devils!"

The region into which the pious departed enter is the *Garō nmāna*, 'the abode of hymns', as the name may be well translated. Here all is light, splendour, and glory, here reigns Ahura Mazda with all the angels, praised by the anthems of the blessed.

Opposite to Paradise lies the abode of the condemned, Hell or 'the dwelling of the demons⁴.' Here eternal night and darkness reign, and the scorn of the demons further enhances the pains and torments, which the fallen soul, doomed to eternal damnation, has to endure.

To the pious the Bard says :

'Whatsoever reward Zarathushtra before conferred upon the truly faithful,

¹ Rv. IX, 41. 2, *suvitasya manāmah? 'ti setum*. Comp. Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 409.

² *Chinvatō peretu* is probably not the 'Bridge of the Assembler,' as I have previously rendered it, but the word *Chinvat* should be derived from the root *chi* 'to suffer, to punish.' Cf. *chitha*. In Vend. XIX, 30, the bridge *Chinvat* is explained by *haetu, mainyavanām yazatanām*.

³ Ys. XLVI, 10-11. I take *astayō* in 11 as nom. plur. of *asti* 'corpus, body ;' comp Ys. XLIX, 11, Spiegel, *Comm.* vol. ii, p. 375.

⁴ For another use of this expression, vide Yt. X, 86, *supra*, p. 30.

(Saying), "In the *Garō nmāna* Ahura Mazda is first of all perceived,"—
Would be conferred upon you, together with happiness, on account of
your good mind and piety¹.'

On the contrary the following threat is pronounced against the impious
who oppose the new doctrine :

'Whoso brings about that the pious man is defrauded, his dwelling is
finally

For a long time in darkness, and vile food and irony (shall fall to his lot).
Towards this region, O ye vicious! your souls will conduct you on
account of your actions².'

The wicked rulers, offenders and liars,
The unbelieving, who are of evil mind and wicked,
Do the souls come to meet with vile food (in Hell).

In truth their bodies will remain in the dwelling of the demons (*Drujas*)³.

The ideas of the later Avesta harmonize entirely with those of the *Gāthās*.
Thus the doctrine of immortality and of eternal judgment was firmly establish-
ed in the earliest period of the Mazda religion as an essential dogma, and
naturally remained so throughout the whole period.

Mention is very often made of the two-worlds, the present and the future,
the earthly and the heavenly⁴. The idea which was in the oldest ages only
incipient, existing as it were only, in embryo, became more and more perfect
with the development of this religion, and was more and more worked out in
all its details.

An exact description of the fate of the soul after death is found in Yasht
XXII. Unfortunately it is incomplete. But as the Minokhired treats of the
same subject, and agrees entirely with the Avesta text, so far as that text is
preserved, we may be allowed to utilize it to supply the deficiency⁵.

The soul of the pious man, as I have already remarked, remains near the
head of the corpse, for three days and three nights, after death has taken place.
During this time the soul experiences, as a foretaste of the joys of Paradise,
greater delight and happiness than it ever enjoyed during its entire life upon
earth.

¹ Ys. LI, 15. I believe the meaning to be as follows: Ahura Mazda has first
entered into Paradise; thither the pious and the faithful will follow Him according to
the promise of Zarathushtra.

² Ys. XXXI, 20. *Dāyat* is to be read in the first line (Bartholomæ, *Gāthās* XXXI);
I would insert *chā* after *avaštās* in the second line.

³ Ys. XLIX, 11.

⁴ *Uvōibyā·ahubyā*, Ys. XXXV, 3; *uvāṣībya·ahubyā*, Ys. LVII, 25; *ahmāichā ahuyē*
manahyāichā, Ys. XL, 2; *parō-asnāi·aguhe*, Ys. LV, 2. Haug and West, 'Essays',
p. 310 seq.

⁵ Yt. XXII; *Minokhired*, 2, p. 114 seq. (West, *Mkh.* 9, 69, 133); comp. Vd. XIX
27-32. Haug and West, 'Essays,' p. 219 seq., 254-255; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. ii, pp. 149-
151.

On the beginning of the fourth day, with the appearance of Aurora, when the gates of the heavens are opened, the soul passes over the Chinvat Bridge. Here justice is administered to it¹. Angels like Srausha, Verthraghna, and the Good Vayu, stand by and support it. Demons, especially the death-bringing Astōvidhōtu and the Wicked Vayu, bearing ill-will towards it, endeavour to secure it for themselves.

Rashnu the Just holds in his hands the scales in which good and evil deeds are weighed against each other—he, who does not yield even a hair's breadth, before whom kings and princes prevail no more than the most indigent and base among men.

Mithra and Srausha intercede on behalf of the soul, evil spirits raise accusations against it. If its pious deeds outweigh the evil ones, it is allowed to pass over the bridge into Paradise.

Under certain conditions it also appears to have been permitted to a particularly pious soul with a surplus of good deeds to render assistance to another that was deficient therein—which would at all events be remarkably analogous to the Catholic belief in saints in many countries. The surplus good works were preserved in a proper region, the *Misvāna*².

The Chinvat Bridge appears to the pious soul 'a *farsang* in breadth. The soul on passing over it meets a most fragrant wind blowing from the southern regions of heaven. It is the breeze wafted from Paradise. And in this wind there appears to the Soul 'its own conscience' in the shape of a charming maiden³—a pretty symbolical impersonation of the inner peace and quietness of soul, which the righteous man enjoys.

With astonishment does the soul ask: 'Who art thou, O Maiden, that seemest to me more beautiful and fair than ever a maiden of earth? Its conscience replies:—I am thy own doing and acting, I am the embodiment of thy good thoughts, words and works, and of thy pious faith,' and then it recounts all the good works which the soul accomplished during its earthly career.

Now the soul enters, at the first step, into Paradise, *Humata*, the place of good thoughts; at the second into that of good words, *Hūkhta*; and at the third to that of good works, *Huvarshata*. Just as all righteousness on earth is divided into the three heads of thought, word, and deed, so also is Paradise, the reward of piety, divided into three regions.

¹ *Chinvat-perethum · Mazdadhātām · baodhascha · urvānemcha · yātem · gaēthanām · paiti-jaidhyēti · dātem · astvairi · aghvō*, 'the bridge *Chinvat*, created by Mazda, where they question the spirit and the soul regarding their behaviour on earth, which they practised during their existence in the body,' Vd. XIX, 29.

² *Vide Justi, Hdb. sub voce misvāna*. The *Misvāna* cannot be compared with the *hamāstagān* of the later Pārsi books (*vide West, Mkh. Glossary s. v*).

³ *Hava · daena* Yt. XXII, 9. The *Minokhired* has a more indefinite expression, *š i hvēsh kuneshn nēk*.

At the fourth step the soul finally attains the region of imperishable splendour, that delightful Paradise, where Ahura Mazda dwells together with angels and the blessed spirits of the earlier pious dead¹.

Vohu Manō, the greatest of the Amesha Spentas after Ahura Mazda, and all the Yazatas rise from their golden seats and question it: 'How comest thou here from the world of mortality and misery to this world of eternity and enjoyment?' But Ahura Mazda says: 'Question it not; it cometh on the awful path of separation of the body and the soul.' Therewith the soul is received into the number of inmates of Paradise; it is conducted to the gold-adorned throne destined for it, and entertained with the most costly of viands.

The fate of the souls of the impious is in all respects the opposite to that of the souls of the pious.

In helpless and despairing anguish the wicked soul wanders about near the corpse for three days and three nights. Even now it feels the weight of all the torments and horrors which await it in Hell. The demon of Death drags it forth in fetters, and when near the Chinvat Bridge, the formidable sentence has been pronounced over it,—'Thou art weighed and found wanting',—it passes towards the region of the condemned.

A foul wind coming from the North meets it, and in that wind it perceives its own conscience in the shape of an ugly hag—the embodiment of all the torments of soul which it feels. Shuddering the Soul asks: 'What art thou, O maiden, that appearest to me more ugly than ever an earthly maiden?' And it receives its reply as follows: 'I am thy own doing and acting, the embodiment of thy evil thoughts, words and works, and of thy false belief!'

As the soul of the pious enters Paradise, the soul of the damned now enters into Hell; first into the place of evil thoughts, next into that of evil words, thence into that of evil works, and lastly into the region of eternal darkness, into the terrible dismal hell full of suffering², which is the abode of Angro Manyu and his followers. Here it is received by the demons with scorn and mockery, and the prince of hell causes it to be furnished with the most foul and nauseous of eatables, loathsome to the taste of men³.

The doctrine of the Avesta regarding the fate of the soul after its departure from this world is directly followed by Eschatology, the doctrine of the last things and of the end of the world.

¹ The names of the particular regions of Paradise, viz., *Humata, Hūkhta, Hūvaršta* and *Anaghra-raochāo* are contained in Yt. XXII, 15. Other designations are *tem · ahūm · yim · ashaonām* 'the world of the pious,' Vd. XVIII, 76; *vahisstem · ahūm · ashaonām · vispōqāthrem, maṣthanem · Ahurahē · Mazdāo, maṣthanem · Ameshanām Spentanām, maṣthanem · anyaeshām · ashaonām* Vd. XIX, 36. From Av. *vahishta* is derived the N. P. *bīshṭ* 'Paradise.' On *Garonmāna*, vide Yt. X, 123; III, 4.

² Hell is called *duzhagh* or *daozhagh*, Yt. XIX, 44, Vd. XIX, 47; comp. the epithets *ereghat*—*temāgha, temaschithra*, Vd. III, 35, V, 62.

³ 'Mockery and foul eatables' are even mentioned in the Gāthās as punishments of Hell. Vide *supra* p. 176.

The visible world is the scene of contest between Ahura Mazda and Angro Manyu, between the good genii and the demons, between the pious and the impious. But this conflict is not an everlasting one, it will end in the complete triumph of the good cause. As, moreover, the earth, by the invasion of the evil spirits, is much disturbed and deformed, its transformation and renovation goes hand in hand with this triumph.

Already in the old hymns the 'dissolution of the world' is spoken of, when the wicked will receive their punishment, and the good their reward :

' I thought of Thee, as the blissful, O Mazda Ahura,
Because I saw Thee as the first one in the beginning of the world.
Because Thou didst first commence the work (of sacrifice) and the
speech, promising reward ;
Namely, evil for the bad, but good blessing for the pious,
By means of Thy Glory at the final dissolution of creation¹.'

If by this a complete annihilation of the world be indicated, the passage seems entirely isolated. However it probably refers, in accordance with the general doctrine of the Avesta, only to a regeneration and renovation of the world, which is of course preceded by manifold conflicts, and especially by the extirpation of all evil.

At all events it is important to note that the everlasting destiny of the good and the wicked is, according to that passage, sealed by the end of the world.

• A final judgment also is coupled with the end of this world.

This idea stands only in apparent contradiction to what is said above, when, consistently with the notion of the Avesta, judgment is pronounced upon the soul immediately after its departure from this world, and the soul in accordance with that decree finds admission either into Paradise or into Hell. Here the soul alone is concerned. But at the end of the world the bodies of the dead will also rise and will share thenceforward the fate of the soul for all eternity.

In the Christian doctrine, which in its very eschatology shows the most curious analogy to that of the Parsees, we meet with the same seeming dilemma. On the one hand, it is indeed believed that the spirit of the dead goes forthwith towards God, or towards the place where it suffers the torments of those separated from Him. On the other hand, the Christian Church teaches that the solemn judgment of the world will only take place on the last day and at the return of Christ.

The dogma of the resurrection of the body belongs, according to my view, already to the Gāthā period, thus to the oldest period of the Zoroastrian

¹ Ys. XLIII, 5 : *dāmōish urvaçə apēmā*, which is apparently contrasted with *ayhēush zāthōi* in verse 2.

religion¹. The *bodies* of the wicked, as it is said in the Avesta, pass into

¹ [Dr. Ferdinand Justi, in his discourse upon Dr. Geiger's *Ostiranische Kultur* (*vid. Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1883), seems to view the matter thus:—The belief in the Immortality of the Soul is in the Zoroastrian doctrine original, but the faith in the Resurrection of the Body could not have originated with the Zoroastrians since they immediately consign the body to destruction. It must have originated from a country where people indicated their belief in a future existence of the body also externally (i.e., by interment in sepulchres or by embalmment of the corpse). Thus it was introduced from Anterior Asia into the land of the Avesta people.—In the first place, it should be observed that from the Avesta precept that the dead body shall be consumed by carcass-eating birds, we must not infer that the Zoroastrian religion does not at all inculcate its preservation. Along with the precept regarding the immediate consumption of the corpse, there is also a strict commandment for erecting an *astōdān* (charnel-hollow) for the preservation of its bones (*vide* Fargard VI, at the end). It is only for the fleshy and fluid portions of the human body, which after death has taken place, are subject to putrefaction and consequently exercise a destructive influence on the living, that the Vendidad explicitly orders its annihilation, while at the same time it commands the proper preservation of the bones. Moreover, the violation of this command is liable to heavy penalties set down in the law. In the second place, the passages referring to the *Frashōkereti* 'the advancement or new formation' in the Gāthās, as well as the description of the Resurrection given in the *Jamyād Yasht*, as interpreted by the author in the text, clearly prove that the resurrection-theory was established in Eastern Irān long before it was propounded by any other monotheistic religion of the civilized world. That Spitama Zarathushtra was the first known prophet by whom this doctrine was revealed to man is confirmed by several Christian writers, amongst whom I would here quote the view of an American author upon this question (*vide* 'History of the Doctrine of Future Life,' by W. R. Alger, Boston, 1880, pp. 140-141):—

'The doctrine of a general resurrection is literally stated in the Vendidad, and in many other places in the Avesta, where it has not yet been shown to be an interpolation, but only supposed so by very questionable constructive inferences. The consent of intrinsic adjustment and of historical evidence, therefore, lead to the conclusion that this was an old Zoroastrian dogma. In disproof of this conclusion we believe there is no direct positive evidence whatever, and no inferential argument cogent enough to produce conviction.

'There are sufficient reasons for the belief that the doctrine of a resurrection was quite early adopted from the Persians by the Jews, not borrowed at a much later time from the Jews by the Parsees. The conception Ahriman, the evil serpent bearing death (*Die Schlange Angramainyus der voll Tod ist*), is interwrought from the first throughout the Zoroastrian scheme. In the Hebrew records, on the contrary, such an idea appears but incidentally, briefly, rarely and only in the later books. The account of the introduction of sin and death by the serpent in the garden of Eden dates from a time subsequent to the commencement of the Captivity. Von Bohlen, in his Introduction to the Book of Genesis, says the narrative was drawn from the Zend-Avesta. Rosenmüller, in his commentary on the passage, says the narrator had in view the Zoroastrian notions of the serpent Ahriman and his deeds. Dr. Martin Haug—an acute and learned writer, whose opinion is entitled to great weight, as he is the freshest scholar acquainted with this whole field in the light of all that others have done—thinks it certain that Zoroaster, lived in a remote antiquity from fifteen hundred to two thousand years before Christ. He says that Judaism after the exile—and, through Judaism, Christianity afterwards—received an important influence from Zoroastrianism, an influence which, in regard to the doctrine of angels, Satan, and the resurrection of the dead, cannot be mistaken. The Hebrew theology had no demonology, no Satan, until after the residence at Babylon. This is admitted. Well, is not the resurrection a pendant to the doctrine of Satan? Without the idea of a Satan, there would be no idea of a retributive banishment of souls

Hell; where they are condemned to corporeal punishment¹. In the later Avesta this dogma is fully expressed in clear words and the resurrection is brought into connection with the regeneration of this world².

The Bundhesh contains a distinct chapter on the end of things. It cannot be my task here to repeat its contents³. I will rather enter into those points of Parsee eschatology which are found already in the Avesta, and I will also refer as much as possible to the age and primitive form of these different dogmas.

The end of the world consisted in a regeneration of creation. This is evident from the expression by which that event is constantly referred to in the Avesta⁴. This expression, moreover, is even used in the more ancient Gāthās, where the poet desires for himself and his friends that they may be included among those who will help to renovate the world⁵.

As is well known, the idea of the return of Christ, and the hope in the same, were especially lively among the primitive Christians. As it appears, the end of the world was also believed, in the very first period of the Zoroastrian community, to be closely impending. Or, can this doctrine, which later on appears in the Parsee writings, have been in force at that time, according to which a small number of chosen pious men are to be preserved in order to help the 'Saviour' in the renovation of the world? But in whatever manner we may understand it, so much is certain, that at least the fundamental features of the Parsee eschatology reach back to the earliest period of the existence of their community, and belong to the oldest and most original doctrines of their system.

If we enter into details, we are really obliged to adduce our quotations from the more modern Avesta for the sake of proof. But still we cannot hence infer in any way that the dogmas contained therein were foreign to the Gāthā period.

The day of doom is preceded by the appearance of three great prophets; Every one of these appears after the expiration of a certain period, every one is regarded as a supernaturally-begotten son of Zarathushtra

into hell, and of course no occasion for a vindictive restoration of them thence to a former or a superior state

'In view of the whole case as it stands, until further researches either strengthen it or put a different aspect upon it, we feel forced to think that the doctrine of a general resurrection was a component element in the ancient Avestan religion.' *Tr. note.*]

¹ Ys. XLVI, 11; *vide supra*, pp. 100-102.

² Yt. XIX, 11 and 89: *yat.irista.paiti.uschishta*. Comp. also Vd. XVIII, 51 . . .

³ *Bundhesh*, chapt. 30. West, 'Pahlavi Texts,' part, i, p. 120 seq. Comp. on the whole Hübschmann, *Die parsische Lehre von Jenseits und jüngsten Gericht* in the *Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.* 1879, pp. 203-245; Windischmann, *Z. St.* p. 231 seq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. ii, p. 158 seq.

⁴ *Frashō-kereti* 'the advancement, extension and new formation.' Verbal form *frashem'kar*.

⁵ *Atchā tōi va:m hyāmā, yōi sm frashēm kerenaon ahūm*, Ys. XXX, 9.

The three prophets are called *Ukhshyat-erta* 'growing piety,' *Ukhshyat-nema* 'growing prayer,' and finally *Astvat-erta* 'embodied piety¹.' The last one is plainly the 'Saviour,' the Redeemer of the world, whom the faithful people expect and long for². His mother is *Erdhat-fedhri*. She bears also the name *Vispa-tarvi* 'the all-conquering,' since he who will be born of her will overcome all torments which originate from men or demons³.

It is also said, that the *Astvat-erta* shall come from the lake *Kansu* far distant in (?) the East⁴, the original fountain and abode of light. It is his task to carry out the renovation of the world. He makes the living immortal, 'he dead he awakens from their sleep. Age, death, and decay he brings to an end. Eternal life, eternal happiness, and the fulfilment of all desires he bestows upon the pious⁵.

But as, according to the German mythology, in the 'twilight of gods' the new earth emerges out of the turmoil of the world's conflagration and of the general battle of gods and giants, so also, according to the ideas of the Zoroastrians, a mighty combat precedes the end of the world.

The demons and their adherents⁶ rise once more with all their might to annihilate the *Astvat-erta* and his companions, who are helping him in the execution of his great work. The last decisive battle takes place between the powers of light and those of darkness. Every genius finds his special opponent among the demons. *Vohu Manō*, the spirit of the Good Mind fights against *Akem Manō*, the spirit of the Bad Mind; *Haurvatāt* and *Amertāt* against Hunger and Thirst; the genius of Truth against the genius of Falsehood; and, finally, *Ahura Mazda* himself against *Angra Manyu*, the Prince of Hell.

But *Astvat-erta*, with the help of the good genii, emerges victorious. The demons are vanquished, evil itself is extirpated. And since all evil originates from the demons, a state of undisturbed bliss is now established, in which the spirits of the pious, no longer injured and attacked by any hostile power live together with *Ahura Mazda* and the other genii.

¹ Yt. XIII, 128. The meaning of the name is explained by Hübschmann, *ZdmG.* vol. xxxv, p. 180.

² Yt. XIII, 129: 'Who will be the victorious saviour with the name of *Astvat-erta* "embodied piety." He is called the saviour, because he will be the safety of the whole world; he is called embodied piety, since he, as a corporeal being of flesh and blood, (*astvāo hā ushtanavāo*), is opposed to the annihilation of corporeal existence.' *Saoshyās*, plural *saoshyāntō* from root *su* 'to help, to rescue,' serves as a designation for a saviour or prophet. Even in the *Gāthās saoshkyāntō* or *saoshyāntō* occurs frequently (the singular form also once); however, I doubt whether it has even here the dogmatical import of the later Avesta. It appears to me better to designate thereby chiefly the teachers and preachers of the Mazdayasnān Community.

³ Yt. XIII, 139; cf. Yt. XIX, 92; *Vispa-taurvayāo puthrō*.

⁴ Vd. XIX, 5; Yt. XIX, 92.

⁵ Yt. XIX, 11-12, and 89 seq.

⁶ According to Yt. XIX, at the end.

§ 12. *The Cult of the Manes.*

WITH the belief in the immortality of the soul the veneration of departed spirits is naturally connected.

Delivered from the care and misery of this world, the soul has departed to the next. There it now dwells, where also the Deity dwells—in a better and more beautiful land. Manifestly it cannot have lost in strength and faculties, but it can only have gained. People, therefore, began to ascribe to it qualities which otherwise plainly describe the divine nature.

If the soul still really exists, there is no cogent ground for considering all intercourse with it as suspended. Pious remembrance, besides, yearns to maintain that communication, and clings to the hope that the body alone may fall a prey to death, but that the soul, invisibly yet perceptibly, may hover over those that remain behind.

It has been known of many a man that anxiety on account of a wife, a child, or a relation, has rendered death so painful to him, that in his last moments he feared for his hereafter and the welfare of those belonging to him. Should all this solicitude and love terminate with his death? Should the soul now suddenly forget all those for whom it has restlessly worked and provided during its life-time? That would be inconceivable, if the spirits of the dead were regarded as higher, more perfect, and more mighty beings than the souls of the living.

So, next to love and reverence for them, personal interest made it desirable to be in communication with departed souls. In them were to be found affectionate advocates near God. In direct proximity to the Deity there were beings with whom men had once been linked by ties of blood, and in whom they could also presuppose a special sympathy for their own good-fortune and welfare, a particular understanding of their special wishes and needs.

From the wish to the belief, however, is only a step.

The Avesta people speak of the *manes* of the dead as the *Fravashis*. Taken strictly, we must understand by the Fravashi, that divine part in men which existing from eternity to eternity, unites itself only for a limited time with the body. Consequently there are Fravashis of such as are dead, of such as are at this time living, and of such as are yet unborn¹. As regards the veneration of the *manes*, naturally those of the first class only are meant.

The worship of the *manes* was a family rite among all Indo-Germanic races. Every one cherished most the memory of those who had when living been nearest and dearest to him. From such could also be expected the readiest help and support in all need and danger. Furthermore, the closer the

¹ *Mat vīspābyō ashaonibyō fravashibyō, yāo īrīrīhushām ashaonām, yāoscha jvañtām ashaonām, yāoscha narām azātānām (frashocharethrām saoshyantām)*, Yt. XXVI, 8. The last words are used as an epithet, of a *diaskeust* who in this passage would recognize, as we may often observe, a reference to the end of this world.

ties of blood and relationship were considered to be, and the greater the consciousness which men felt, as belonging to this or that family, this or that clan, the more would that family rite develop and command respect.

I have already alluded several times to the fact that the family pride of the Eastern Irānian people was extremely vigorous. In consequence of this also does the religious veneration of the *manes* play a very important part in their system.

The nation¹ is based upon the family, which developes itself into the clan, the clan growing into the tribe. There were also Fravashis of the family, of the clan, of the tribe, of the country², spirits of the deceased relations of the family, and spirits of the members of the clan, tribe, or country. They had all more or less claim to honourable commemoration, and in a certain measure to a special worship. But in preference to all others, offerings were made to the Fravashis of the next-of-kin, to those who had belonged to one's own family. Hence such Fravashis also form for themselves a particular category, having a distinct appellation³.

The Fravashis of the original members of the tribe or country must have been invoked in general only during offerings and prayer. Reverence may also have been paid to individuals of special eminence, namely such as had lived in ancient days, and had been glorified by myth and legend. Individual families or clans paid homage probably to their common ancestor, whole tribes to their founders and the establishers of their power. Thus the veneration of the *manes* is accompanied with a cult of heroes.

As the Fravashis are revered within the family, so also do they on their part render to every one of their family or their race help and protection. At the time of the *Hamaspatmaidhaya* festival, when the earth awakens from her winter-sleep and when nature begins to stir with new life, the souls come back from the next world to the earth. For several days they dwell among men; and if they find that their memory still survives among their relatives or descendants, and that their service is neither forgotten nor neglected, then they support them, bestow upon them plenty, prosperity and blessings, pour out in abundance water that moistens their fields and protect them against the assaults of their enemies.

'They, the spirits, fly towards their village at the time of *Hamaspatmaidhaya*, and go round about here for ten nights long. They wish for such help, observing: Who will praise us, who will offer to us?'⁴

¹ Lit. country.

² *Fravashayō . . . nmānyāō, vīsyāō, zantumāō daqyumāō*, Yt. XIII, 21; cf. Yt. XIII, 150-151; Ys. XXVI, 1.

³ *Fravashayō-nabānazdishtanām*, Ys. XXIII, 4; XXVI, 6, &c.

⁴ Yt. XIII, 49; *visādhā* must be read in the first line, for in the second it would disturb the metre.

'They deal out water, each to his own relations, his house, his village, his community and his country, also saying: "Our country shall increase in wealth and prosperity!"'

'They fight in the combat, each for his land and his district, as if some land and house have been fixed for them as their dwelling¹.'

In war and battle especially the *manes* manifest their powerful help; and here I believe we directly touch upon a sphere of primitive ideas. They continually make their appearance as powerful and well-armed combatants. In the heat of battle their assistance is invoked. Here they stand by the side of the pious, and help them to gain the victory:—

'They the Fravashis of pious people convey their utmost assistance in fierce battles².'

'They form many armies, and carry hundreds of weapons; they bear banners, the radiant, who in hot fighting hurriedly descend, who vigorously and rapidly give battle to the Dānūs; ye have subdued the opposition of the Tūrānian enemies³.'

The antiquity of these ideas is attested by the fact that we find in the Rig-veda quite similar invocations and prayers, which the old Indian addresses to the *manes*, the '*Fathers*'. Here, also, they are chiefly esteemed as mighty warriors and as helpers in battle⁴.

'Lovely sit together our *Fathers*, dispensing vitality, exposing themselves to peril, full of strength, inexhaustible, with glistening spears powerful arrows, not lingering, real heroes, ruling far and wide subduing entire armies:'

'The priestly *Fathers*, loving the Soma-drink, and the salutary heaven and earth, who have not their equal, and Pushan shall protect us against misfortune. O ye Increaseers of Holiness! no malevolent demon shall obtain power over us⁵.'

As to the Zoroastrians, however, closer or more remote relationship was not their sole guide in the veneration of departed spirits. They also took into account the attitude, hostile or friendly, which the dead had assumed during their life time with respect to the Mazda-religion.

¹ Yt. XIII, 66-67. We should read *dādharma*. Comp. Skr. *dhr*, which is perhaps construed with the acc. and dat.: 'to persuade anybody to do anything.'

² Yt. XIII, 17. *Dāhishta* is derived from *dāha*, formed from root *dā* 'to give' Comp. Skr. *dāsvat*, *sudās*.

³ Yt. XIII, 37-38. *Khshtāvi* might be translated by 'a chariot-warrior,' and referred for confirmation to Skr. *sthātṛ*. However, *khshtāvi* probably means simply 'active, stout, hero' (like *takhma*, *aurva*), to which we would compare *khshtāvant*, an epithet of the moon, perhaps 'the wandering, speedy,' just as *shtum* and *khtūm* 'a hare = the swift one' in the Pāmīr dialects (Tomaschek, p. 31).

⁴ Kaegi, *Der Rig-veda*, p. 61, notes 346 and 347.

⁵ Rig-veda, VI, 75, 9-10.

First of all 'the Fravashis of pious men and women' form one principal category and are invoked as such very frequently. This form of invocation alone goes to prove that the unbelieving also owned their Fravashis; yet neither adoration nor offering was ever vouchsafed to them. However, we may admit that they constituted the other principal category.

Among the spirits of the pious, the Fravashis of those that lived and died before the coming of Zarathushtra, and before the announcement of his doctrine¹ form a separate group. I have already observed that reverence for the *manes* naturally leads also to hero-worship. Such religious observances in honour of the heads of tribes or other heroes of antiquity probably existed of old among the different Eastern Irānian families and races, when the reform movement began, which is connected in history with the name of Zarathushtra. It was impossible to eradicate them, because the people strictly adhered to such family customs with singular pertinacity. Nor were these customs even begrudged a place amongst the new doctrines, where room was found for them by regarding those heroes as the followers of an ancient and venerable religion, which preceded Zoroastrism, and to a certain extent paved the way for it.

Moreover, later on a distinct position was held by the Fravashis of those pious persons who had been thought worthy to behold the prophet face to face, to hear his doctrine from his own lips, and to receive it from himself. These are the Fravashis of the contemporaries and first adherents of Zarathushtra². They are followed by the great multitude of the Fravashis of those in general who belonged to the Mazdayasnian community, and paid allegiance to the religion of Ahura.

The sphere within which the Fravashis were supposed to have power was a very elastic one. It seems that people always ascribed to them, as time went on, more and more influence and higher faculties. When the souls of the pious, departing in countless multitudes, occupied the apartments of Heaven, their influence was to be felt everywhere. Thus they become at last the supporters and preservers of the whole world, with whose help Ahura Mazda rules over earth and heaven :

'Through their power and their glory I uphold firmly the firmament,
O Zarathushtra ! which, blazing on high, surrounds this earth far
away from its side and in a circle³.'

¹ These are the *fravashayō paoiryō-kaēshanām* 'the souls of those who belonged to the first (pre-Zarathushtrian) religion.' A distinction is also to be observed between *kaēsha daēna* !—Yt. XIII, 150 ; *paoīrijān kaēshē yazamaide* ; *nmānanāmcha vīsāmcha zahtunāmcha daqyunāmcha yōi āoghare paoiryē kaēshē yazamaide* 'the earlier pious we revere ; those, who were the earlier pious in family, race, tribe or country, we revere.'

² *Fravashayō paoīryanām sāsno-gūshām*, 'the Fravashis of the first ones, who listened to the doctrine.' Yt. XIII, 149.

³ Yt. XIII, 2. The second *yō* is to be extended in order to preserve the metre.

It is the Fravashis that keep up the sacred stream Ardvi-sūra, in order that it may flow on with great force and volume. They make the sun, moon-and stars follow their paths¹; it is they that support the fastnesses of the earth.

‘Through their power and their glory, O Zarathushtra! I support the wide Earth, created by Ahura, the great, broad one, who is the bearer of much beauty, who bears the whole corporeal world, living and dead, and the high mountains, which abound in pastures and fountains².’

We have to thank the Fravashis, when children are preserved in the mother’s womb, when women are easily delivered, and when excellent sons who ‘are active in council and whose words are heard with pleasure,’ rejoice them³.

And not only does the Ardvi-sūra stand under their protection. It is their principal charge that the precious element of water, the fundamental importance of which for life and cultivation was so very clearly impressed upon the Eastern Irānians, may be well spread over their country; and they also support the other genii, who are entrusted with that work. Hence it is also they who cause the plants to germinate and sprout for the nourishment of men and beasts.

‘Through their power and their glory the waters gush forth impetuously from inexhaustible sources. Through their power and their glory plants spring up from the earth from inexhaustible sources. Through their power and their glory winds chasing away clouds blow from inexhaustible sources⁴.’

‘They can travel to the star *Satavaisa* (*posted*) between earth and heaven, who causes waters to flow, granting prayers, who causes waters to run and plants to germinate for the nourishment of beasts and men, for the maintenance of the Arian countries, for the nourishment of the five kinds of cattle, for the protection of pious men⁵.’

In conclusion I must notice yet one point more.

It has been observed that the cult of the Fravashis stands in close connection with the stars and the veneration paid to them⁶. We have already heard that the stars are under the special protection of the Fravashis. Even the latter are themselves undoubtedly identified with the stars, when it is said of them that, led along the celestial path, they travel on the heights of the firmament⁷.

¹ Yt. XIII, 4-8, 16, 57.

² Yt. XIII, 9. Cf. Geldner, *Metrik*, § 120.

³ Yt. XIII, 11, 15, 16; Geldner, *Metrik*, § 109.

⁴ Yt. XIII, 14.

⁵ Yt. XIII, 43. Regarding the star *Satavaisa*, *vide infra*. It is better to read *pañchō-hayayāo* instead of *pañchō-hyayāo* (cf. the variants in Westergaard), and to trace the word *haya* from rt. *hi* = Skr. *si*.

⁶ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. ii, p. 98.

⁷ Yt. XIII, 42: *mainyu-shūfāo frashūqeñti*barəshnavō avānhē ashnō*.

The true home of star-worship is really Mesopotamia ; nevertheless I would not suppose that the notion of the Fravashis being stars is due to any Semitic influence. We very often meet with analogies between two different nations in morals, culture, and religion ; yet I do not consider it fair to regard such a conformity as the result of borrowing or external influence when no other grounds for such a supposition can be adduced. How easily may such resemblances present themselves in different countries having no mutual dependence on each other, provided that analogous conditions are found to pre-exist in history and nature .¹ I mean that the assumption of a borrowing is an explanation which the writer of the history of civilization should adopt very sparingly. So long as we are able to interpret a phenomenon as one produced in an organic manner, we may rest content with the above explanation.

So with the Irānians and Semites. The idea of identifying the souls that have passed into the heavenly kingdom, with the numberless stars shining and blazing in the firmament is by no means foreign to human nature. A somewhat vivid fancy can take this turn precisely as well in Central Asia as in Asia Minor.

The heavens and stars have certainly not occupied the human mind in Mesopotamia alone. Why should the eyes of the Arian not have been directed towards them in the low plains near the Oxus and the Jaxartes, where, moreover, the stars glitter with a peculiarly bright lustre through the clear atmosphere of the desert ? Why should he not have guessed at the unknown land behind the mysterious space of heaven, wherein the departing soul wanders and where it shines in the form of a star ?

Here I may even call to mind the well-known popular belief of the Germans, according to which the soul, particularly the soul of a child, on separating from the body, is transformed into a star. Finally I may also observe that, according to the Indian idea, the '*Fathers*' are connected with the stars. The '*Fathers*,' says the Rig-veda, 'adorned heaven with stars, as a black horse with pearls'.²

¹ The idea which I would thereby convey is this, that according to my conviction the Avesta religion must be interpreted wholly from its own teaching. I do not believe that it has borrowed anything from the Semites. It is the special property of the Eastern Irānian nation. Even where apparent or real similarities strike us, we ought to assume them to be mere accidental coincidence.

² Rv. X, 68, 11 ; Justi *Hdb.* s. v. *fravashi* ; Kaegi, *Der Rig-veda*, p. 62, note 348.

CHAPTER III ¹.

MENTAL AND MORAL CULTURE.

§ 15. *Man in Relation to his Body and Soul.*

THE mental and moral gifts of a people, the extent of their general knowledge and their ethics, are an essential constituent of their culture. They are not of less importance for the right understanding of the stage of civilization, which they have reached, than perhaps their social and political institutions. We must, therefore, also briefly discuss those features of Eastern Irānian life.

The spiritual horizon of the Avesta people is naturally still comparatively narrow. Their knowledge is empiric, the sum total of many more or less accidental experiences and observations. An investigation, conscious of its aim, which had for its object the deliverance of the human mind from the fetters of error, we can hardly presuppose.

It is, however, interesting to see how the old Irānian observed with a clear eye and mind the world and its phenomena, and endeavoured to bring into an organized system the observations made regarding the earth and the heavens. Not all the knowledge which we find amongst the Avesta people is self-acquired. We cannot consider as an age of rude unrefinement and ignorance the Arian epoch in which the Indians and the Irānians, still united, formed one and the same nation. From them the Avesta people inherited a great deal, and employed their inherited talents to the greatest advantage. In many cases the very first germs and rudiments of some branch of knowledge may be traced back to the primitive Arian age, but their further cultivation and development belong to the separate history of both the tribes.

Hence it is not easy always to distinguish the old property from the newly-acquired possessions. This is, however, so much the less to be regretted as it most concerns us to indicate the degree of spiritual culture to which the Avesta people had attained, and to fix to a certain extent the limits of their knowledge.

I now commence with the observations which the old Irānian made regarding man himself.

Man consists of body and soul. The body is composed of numerous constituents and members, several of which have their special names². It is,

¹ Chapter V, § 35, *Ostīrānische Kultur*.

² Body : *kehrpa* ; Skr. *kṛp* 'a handsome look'—*tanu*=Skr. *tanu*.

Bone : *astan*, *asti*=Skr. *asthan*, *asthi*.

Skin : *pāsta* (Tomaschek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 45).

Flesh appears to be *kehrpa* ; comp. *kerefah-hvara*.

Marrow, brain : *mazga*=Skr. *majja*.

Blood : *vohuni*=Skr. *vasā*.

Fat : *ūtha* (?)—*ptvagh* (?)

Head : *sara*=Skr. *qiras* ; further, Ir. *kameredha*, *vaghdhana*.

however, to be observed that most of these names were not first invented by the Irānians, but are actually of Arian origin. A collection of such names might not be without interest. The Avestā contains particular designations for flesh, skin, and bone, blood, marrow, and fat. Of the bodily parts the following are recognized : the head (including hair and beard), face, and forehead, eye, eyebrows, nose, mouth (with teeth and tongue), chin, cheek, and ear. After these follow : the neck, back, shoulder, armpit, and chest. The

Hair : *varesa* (N. Pers. *gurs*) ;—? *gaṛsa* (*Hdb. sub voce*).

Beard : *raṣsha* (cf. Tomaschek, p. 47).

Face and forehead : *ainika*=Skr. *anika*.

Eye : *akshī*, *chashman*, *dōithra*, Skr. *akshī*, *chakshman*.

Eyebrows : *brvat*=Skr. *bhrū*.

Nose : *nāogha* and *nāoghan* ; Skr. *nāsā*.

Mouth : *āogha*=Skr. *ūs*.

Tooth : *dañtan*=Skr. *dantan*.

Tongue ; *hizva*=Skr. *jihvā*.

Jaw, cheek : *paitish-garena* (*ZddmG.* vol. xxxiv, p. 419).

Ear : *gaosha* (also *ghūsh*, *ghokh*, and *ghowar* are found in Tomaschek's *Pāmirdialekte*, p. 50) corresponds to the Skr. *karna*, Ir. *karena*, 'deaf' (just as in Tomaschek's *Pāmirdialekte*, p. 83).

Neck : *grīva*=Skr. *grīvā*.

Back : *parshiti*=Skr. *prshthā*.

Shoulder : *supti*=Skr. *ṣṣṭi*.

Shoulder, arm-pit : *kasha*=Skr. *kaksha* 'waist.'

Breast : *vara* and *uragh*=Skr. *uras* ; *paitivara* the upper-chest, collar-bone ;—*fshtāna* ('nipple' *Vd.* IX, 19) also for the female-breast,=Skr. *stana*.

Ribs : *peresa*=Skr. *pārṣva*.

Waist, the middle part of the body : *maidhya*=Skr. *madhya* (Tomaschek, p. 44).

Belly, abdomen : *kushi*=Skr. *kukshi* (Tomaschek, p. 55).

Navel : *nabi*=Skr. *nābhī*.

Hips : *sraoni*=Skr. *ṣraṇi* (*clunes*) ; also probably *pudenda*. Comp. *perethu-sraoni*=*prthu-ṣraṇi*.

Thighs : *hakhti*=Skr. *sakthi* and *sakthan*, also translated 'shame.'

Pudenda : (a) female : *upasta*, *yaona*=Skr. *upastha*, *yoni*. (b) male : *fravākhsha*, an euphemism for the *membrum virile*, perhaps 'a branch, a sprout,' *ZddmG.* vol. xxxiv, p. 419 ; like German 'Rute' and Indian *vaitasa* 'reed.'

Arm : *bāzu*=Skr. *bāhu* ; *arema* (Tomaschek, p. 53).

Hand : *zasta*=Skr. *hastā*.

Elbows : *bareshti* (Tomaschek, p. 53).

Finger : *erezu* 'straight' ; *tbishi* 'finger-joint' ;—*aṅgushta* 'thumb'=Skr. *aṅgushṭha*.

Fist : *mushti*=Skr. *mushti*.

Right and left : *dashina*, *havya*=Skr. *dakshina*, *savya*.

The bone from the thigh up to the knee : *rāna*.

Knee : *zhnu*=Skr. *jānu*.

The calf of the leg : *aschu*.

The shinbone : *zanga*=Skr. *jaṅghā*.

Foot : *pādha*=Skr. *pāda*.

The instep : *frabda*=Skr. *prapada*.

The sole : *hakha*.

The heel ; *pāshna*=Skr. *pārshni*.

Heart : *zaredhaya*=Skr. *hṛdaya*.

Lungs : *sushi* (Tomaschek, p. 54).

female breast is particularly distinguished. Further, the ribs, waist, abdomen, navel, hips, thighs, male and female sexual parts; the arm, elbow, hand, finger, fist; the upper-thigh, knee, calf of the leg, shinbone, foot, the instep, the sole, and heel. Besides, I remark the distinction between right and left; and lastly, the names of the two internal organs, the heart and the lungs.

The Doctrine of the Soul in the Avesta, is not to be called quite simple and wholly primitive. At all events it presupposes a certain amount of philosophical speculation. It rests upon the observation that the spiritual activity of man expresses itself in manifold ways¹, and upon the conclusion thence inferred, that in man a multiplicity of forces exist, of which each one has its own well-defined sphere of action. Besides, it is a specific production of the Irānian mind, and hardly admits, in its very essence, of any connection with pre-existing ideas and doctrines.

There are generally five, less frequently four, spiritual faculties, which are supposed to be innate in the human body. They are, according to their nature and efficacy, entirely different from one another, partly without beginning and without end, partly transitory, partly not existing from eternity-yet certainly continuing for ever. They are called (1) *Conscience*, (2) *Vital Force*, (3) *Soul* as a moral power, (4) *Spirit*, in the sense of consciousness and intelligence, and (5) '*Fravashi*.' Instead of the two first names there is also now and then used a special expression, which, however, does not probably denote anything more than the principle of life².

Conscience is a divine power, which exists from eternity to eternity independently of the mortal body, an inherent voice which tells man immediately after every action, whether that action was good or bad, and accordingly it praises or accuses him. Its purity and sanctity cannot be affected by the sins of man, since it has no part in them. As long as it is possible, conscience restrains man from guilt and sin; when it is no longer able to do so, it sorrowfully abandons him and returns to heaven. This doctrine is based undoubtedly on the experience that man is able, in course of time, to drown the warning voice within and to lose his conscience.

¹ *Vide supra* p. 165.

² The Avesta expressions are *daēna*, *āghu*, *urvan*, *baodhañh*, *fravashi*, Ys. XXVI, 4 and 6; Yt. XIII, 149. Instead of *daēna* and *āghu* there stands in Ys. LV, 1. *tevishi* from the root *tu* 'to be strong.' Besides, it is probably only a synonym for *āghu* and *daēna* 'conscience,' which does not mean a force peculiarly belonging to man, but rather a force working upon him from without, and is in fact omitted in the passage concerned. In later times the well-known passage of the Sadder-Bundehesh (in Spiegel's *Trad. Lit.* pp. 172-176), which discusses the Parsee doctrine of the soul and harmonizes most completely with the ideas of the Avesta, was naturally and especially made use of to represent this idea. In this passage are enumerated the five faculties, *jān*, *akhō*, *rvān*, *bōi* and *frōhar*. The last three correspond with the last three soul-powers of the Avesta, not merely in name, as the description which follows in the Sadder proves, but in their essence; *jān* is, however, undoubtedly parallel to Av. *āghu*, and *akhō* to *daēna*.

Of course the continuance of its existence is by no means prejudiced by the death of man. It is a characteristic of its nature that, according to the Avesta, it still exercises its influence after death on the soul wandering into the next world. To the soul of the pious man it appears personified in the form of a charming maiden, who hails him as happy on account of good actions done during life ; but to that of the impious man it appears in the form of an ugly hag, who upbraids him with reproachful words for all his sins, and bitterly accuses him on account of them¹.

By this it is not meant that conscience is not unchanging, but only that it appears in one form to the one and in another form to the other. It terrifies, torments and alarms the wicked, but on the good it confers joyfulness and peaceful serenity.

To the *Vital Power* it is appointed to find and watch over the corporeal functions of man. It originates only with the body and perishes with the matter.² It has therefore a beginning as well as an end, and occupies in consequence the lowest rank among the faculties of the soul.

The *Spirit* is the intellectual power in man : his consciousness, intelligence and reason³. If death be regarded as a separation of the body and the spirit the latter must have a somewhat general signification. The business of the spirit is to rule over the memory, understanding and judgment, in order that each may perform its duty and co-operate for the welfare of the body. It appears to come into being first with the body, but after death to unite with the soul and the Fravashi, and to accompany them into the next world.

The *Soul* has to choose for itself between good and evil. It has a moral power by virtue of which man possesses a moral freedom of election. It *should* of course make choice of what is good, it *can*, however, turn also towards evil. For this reason it must account after death, together with the

¹ Vide *supra* pp. 177-179.

² [The Avesta does not say anything with reference to the non-existence of *aghu* after death. On the contrary we praise the *aghu* of every pious Mazdayasna after his departure from this world. Comp. Ys. XXVI, 4. Vide my paper in the *Bombay Gazette* of Nov. 3, 1882, on the 'Avesta Doctrine regarding the Body and Soul.'

With reference to this note Dr. E. W. West remarks in a letter to Dastur Peshutonji — 'As to *anghu* your son rightly corrects Dr. Geiger, as the word evidently means both bodily and spiritual life.—What life is we do not know, but even in its common acceptance it seems to be some spiritual property that becomes manifest in the body ; whether it begins and ends with the body we do not yet know, as hitherto we have found no means of maintaining the sensible existence of the one without the other, but we can conceive that such is possible. These, however, are matters of speculation in which I do not often indulge ; but I am fully persuaded that if mankind ever discover anything certain about the spiritual world, by means of their own researches, they will have to change all their past notions regarding psychology and philosophy.'

³ Hence *baodhō-varshā* is an act perpetrated with consciousness and deliberation (Vd. VII, 38). Comp. also *baodhō-vidhvāo-chichithwāo baodhāghaitim vithushim* (Vd. XVIII, 67).—A wound which deprives one of consciousness (not of life, as Justi understands), is called *snatha-frazā-baodhāgh* (Vd. IV, 40, &c.)

spirit, for its behaviour on earth¹, and, according to the result of the judgment, it receives either eternal bliss or damnation. Frequently, 'soul' is the designation for all the immortal powers of man that have passed into the other world.

Lastly, with the spirit and the soul is united after death the *Fravashi*, in order to form from that time an indivisible whole. The *Fravashi*, however, appears to be by its nature not only imperishable like the conscience, but also without beginning. It would be best to consider it as a tutelary spirit that watches over man and protects him. Hence the *Fravashis* and the *manes* or spirits of the dead are almost identical; for that reason there are also *Fravashis* of those who are yet unborn². It is only for the time during which a man lives that the guardian spirit descends from Heaven on this earth and accompanies him on his way....

§ 14. *The World.*

This section will treat of the knowledge and ideas which the Avesta people had of this visible world, its structure and organization. We may begin by quoting a few strophes of an old hymn which we cannot but think one of the most poetical passages in *Gāthās*. They show us that the pious mind of the old Irānian beheld in all the phenomena and wonders of nature the ever-working power of the Deity :

'That I ask of Thee, give me truly answer, O Ahura :

Who was the progenitor and father of order from the beginning ?

Who made their courses to the Sun and Stars ?

Who made it that the moon waxes and wanes, who but Theo ?

This, O Mazda, and other things I long to know !'

'That I ask of Thee, give me truly answer, O Ahura :

Who then kept the earth and the clouds above,

That they fall not ? Who made the water and the plants ?

Who gave their swiftness to the wind and the fogs ?

Who is, O Mazda, the creator of the pious mind ?'

'That I ask of Thee, give me truly answer, O Ahura :

Who is the artificer that made light and darkness ?

Who is the artist that made sleep and wakefulness ?

Who made the dawns, the mid-days and the evenings,

Which remind the careful of their duties ³ ?'

¹ Vd. XIX, 29 ; vide *supra* pp. 77, 78, 79.

² Ys. XLIV, 3-5.

³ Vide *supra* p. 113.

Tat·thwā·peresā·eresh·mōi·vaochā·Ahurā :

Kasnā·zāthā·patā·ashahyā·paouruuyō ?

Kasnā·geng·staremhā·dāt·advānem ?

Ke·yā·māo·ukhshyētī·nerefsaitī·thwat ?

Tā·chit·Mazdā·vasemī·anyāchā·viduyē !

Tat·thwā·peresā·eresh·mōi·vaochā·Ahurā·

The earth, with which I begin, is the dwelling-place of man and the other animals : bearing and feeding everything, she is the great mother, the bounteous one from whose lap trees and herbs grow up to give nourishment to all creatures¹.

As to its shape, it was thought, it seems, to be a large disc. That is meant, in my opinion, by the epithets 'wide,' 'broad,' 'round,' 'far-limited².' In old Indian the earth is likewise called 'the wide.'

The special guardianship of the earth is confided to Spentā Ārmati, a female genius of temperate and devout mind³. What kind of connection there existed between the moral and material functions of Ārmati cannot easily be stated.

Certainly, she is the genius of the earth, whenever she is called the dwelling-place and home of mankind⁴. It is to her that Yima applies, as the earth, which he inhabits, has no longer sufficient space for man and beasts, praying :

'For love's sake, O Spentā Ārmati, widen and extend thyself, thou mother of flocks and herds and humankind !'

And Yima extended the earth, so that it was larger by one-third than before, and there spread over it flocks and herds and men to their pleasure, as fully as they listed⁵.

The first attempts at dividing and classifying the surface of the earth according to certain principles, are to be sought for in an ante-Irānian period. In the Avesta the earth is considered either tripartite or septempartite. Both methods of division are met with also amongst the Indians, although there exist several discrepancies in the details⁶.

Kasnā·deretā·zāmchū·adcnabāoschū·

Avapastōish ? ke·apō·urvarāoschū·

Ke·vūtāish·dvānnaibyaschū·yaoget·āsū ?

Kasnū·vagheush·Mazdā·dāmish·managhō ?

Tat·thwā·peresā·eresh·mōi·vaochū·Ahurā :

Ke·hvāpāo·raochāoschū·dāt·temāoschū ?

Ke·hvāpāo·qafnemchā·dāt·zaēmāchū ?

Ke·yā·ushāo·arem·pithwā·khshapāchū·

Yā·manōthrish·chazdōghvañtem·arethaky ?

¹ *Yā·nāo baraiti* 'which bears (feeds) us,' Ys. XIII, 1 (cf. the significations 'to feed', 'to foment,' 'to keep up,' for Skr. *bhar*); *berethri* 'bearer,' 'mother,' =Skr. *bhartṛ*.—*Zām. hudhāōghem* (=Skr. *sudās*) *yazamaidē*, Ys. XVI, 6.

² *Perethu* (cf. Skr. *prthivi* 'earth'), *pathana*, *skarena* (in the Pamir dialects *kard* and *cherd* mean 'curved,') and *dura*: *pāra*.

³ The opposite of *ārmaiti* (from *aram*=Skr. *alam*, + *maiti* from the rt. *man* 'to think') is, (Ys. LX, 5), *taromaiti* 'intemperate thinking, pride, haughtiness.' In like manner in Ys. XLV, 11 *tarēm·māsta* and *arēm·mainyātā* are opposed to each other. The reader may compare also *taramaitish qatēush* 'disregard of relationship.' In the Gāthās *āramaitish* (=Skr. *aramati*) is tetrasyllabic.

⁴ Ys. XVI, 10; *yazamaidē thwām maēthanem yām ārmaitim : spentām*.

⁵ Vd. II, 10 seq.

⁶ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 88 seq; Justi *Beiträge*, at the beginning; Justi, *Bundeshesh*, Glossary, s. v. *Kāshvar*.

If the Avesta speaks of the three thirds of the earth, the fact recalls vividly to our minds the 'three earths' of the Rig-veda, the superior, the intermediate, and the inferior¹. Three strata or layers, one lying above the other, are said to be meant by this. That is certainly not the meaning of the Avesta. In my opinion it means nothing more than a quite primitive division of the earth into three zones; such a division might easily be suggested or occasioned by the nature of the country.

The intermediate zone of the earth is that in which the Avesta people live. Here they wage their wars against the hereditary enemies of their tribe the Tūrānians². To the North of them extend the inaccessible deserts and steppes near the Aral and Caspian Seas, from which those Tūrānians burst forth to devastate the Arian countries in their inroads. They may be supposed to form the second, or Northern, third of the earth. South of the Irānian territory are situated the hot sand and salt steppes of Central Persia, of Baluchistān, and the unknown India—the last third, or the Southern zone.

A more complicated division of the earth is that into seven *Karshvars*, since it seems to be in contradiction with what we have just mentioned. It is certainly very old, for the Gāthās already speak of the 'septempartite earth'³. According to the statements of later Parsee Scriptures, the seven Kēshvars are to be considered as completely disconnected parts of the earth. Between them there flows the ocean, so that it is impossible, as stated in several passages to pass from one Kēshvar to another⁴. Mythological explanations of the origin of the Kēshvars are not wanting.

The coincidence of this doctrine with the Indian one touching the seven *Dvipas*, as met with in the *Purānas*, is self-evident. It did not also escape the notice of the Parsees, as we may see from traditional Sanskrit translations of Zoroastrian documents⁵.

But incongruities are not wanting. The *Dvipas* form concentric rings, which separated by the ocean, surround Jambu Dvipa, which is situated in the centre. According to the Irānian view, the *Karshvar Qaniratha* is likewise situated in the centre of the rest. They form no concentric circles, but each of them is a peculiar, individual space, and so they group themselves round *Qaniratha*. Two, *Voru-barshli* and *Voru-zarshli*, lie in the North; two, *Vidadhafshu* and *Fradadhafshu*, in the South; *Savahi* and *Arzahi* in the East and West.

¹ Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 357.

² *Ys.* XI, 7: 'May not Hauma fetter thee, as he fettered the pernicious Frangrasyan of Tūrān, the iron-clad, in the middle third of the earth.'

³ *Ys.* XXXII, 3; *būmi-haptāiti*.

⁴ Cf. e.g. *Vd.* I, 4 of the Pahlavi Translation; *Bdh.* XXI, 2-3.

⁵ Neriösengh, the translator of the *Yasna*, consistently renders *Karshvarc* by *Dvipa*, and especially *Qaniratha* by *Jambudvipa* (cf. also West, *Mkh.* s. v. *Kēshvar*).

We shall, I think, arrive at a rather accurate notion of the original conception by looking upon it in the simplest possible light. Perhaps it was remodelled under the actual influence of India and did not receive the shape which appears in the later Scriptures of the Parsees, save by contact with the doctrine of the Dvipas. In the Avesta the Karshvars certainly were nothing but a progression and differentiation of the tripartite division of the earth. The intermediate Karshvar Qaniratha coincides more or less with the intermediate zone, and is reputed to be the home of Irānian human-kind¹. The Northern and the Southern zones are each separated into two halves; the Karshvar in the East and that in the West are new additions. By this I do not mean to say that the tripartition is an older, the septempartition a later notion; both may have grown up together, and both form more or less definite conceptions of the same object.

In the Avesta the expression, 'the seven Karshvars,' is nothing but a comprehensive view of the whole earth, in the same way as the three thirds². It seems also to presuppose the possibility of communication between the single parts of the earth. At least utterance is given to the desire that the religion of Zarathushtra may spread over the seven Karshvars of the earth³. It would be necessary to take refuge in a rather artificial interpretation, were we to think of any other mode of propagation of the Zoroastrian doctrine than that by the natural means of the proselytizing labour of believing priests.

I therefore think that by Qaniratha is meant the country inhabited by the Irānian tribes, and, by the other names, the adjacent territories of foreign nations in the North, South, West and East.

Above the three thirds of the earth spreads the *firmament* or *sky*, the dwelling-place of the clouds and fogs, and above these *heaven* properly so called. It is propped up by the Fravashis, to whose care the order of the world is confided, that it may not break in pieces⁴. It is the home of the divine beings, as the earth is the home of men. Here we must suppose the regions of Paradise must be looked for, the highest of which is the *Garō-nmāna*, the resplendent mansion of Ahura Mazda and of the other genii and happy spirits.

Heaven, as its name in the Avesta implies, was thought to be made of stone. It is also called 'the swift', on account of the rapid rotation and revolution of the firmament⁵. The later Scriptures of the Parsees make a difference between an inner and an outer Heaven. The latter is a wall built of blue

¹ Hence *Qaniratha* alone is combined with *imat* 'this,' while all other *Karshvars* with *avat* 'that;' Vd. XIX, 39.

² Cf. e.g. Yt. X, 15-16.

³ Yt. XIII, 94; *idha apām-vījasaiti vāghvī-daēna Māzdayasnish* (vispāish) avi karshvān yāish hapta. Vide Geldner, Metrik, § 131.*

⁴ Yt. XIII, 2-3; see above, p. 117.

⁵ *Asman* 'stone' and *thwāsha* 'swift,' from rt. *thwuksh* 'to hasten.'

stone, and serves to keep off the evil spirits. To the former, which is in continual motion, the stars are fixed¹.

A distinction of the different points of the compass was not unknown to the Avesta people. The Eastern Irānians named them entirely as the Indians did, facing the rising sun. So the East is called the anterior, the West the posterior region; the South is the region on the right, the North that on the left hand². According to another terminology, the Avesta people designated the East as the region of the 'rising (sun),' the West as that of the 'setting (sun),' the North, which is regarded as the domain of all evil and hurtful powers, as the 'starless region,' and the South, like the peoples of the Occident, as 'mid-day³.'

Among the celestial orbs, the Sun⁴, the day-star, is venerated most. The Irānian beholds in light the symbol of moral purity and the peculiar sphere for celestial genii to work in. The Sun, therefore, as the bearer of light, is to be regarded as a prominently powerful champion against demons.

'If the sun does not rise, then the demons would destroy all things that exist in the seven parts of the earth; nor are the heavenly spirits in this visible world able to find means of defence or resistance⁵.'

As the eye is the light of the human body, so is the sun the light of heaven or its eye. But the bright clear heaven (or sky) was in the old popular religion personified in the Highest God, Ahura Mazda. Therefore, in the Avesta the sun is called His eye⁶. Such symbols of nature are rare in the Avesta religion, by far rarer, without doubt, than in the Vedic. It is, therefore the more gratifying to find both agreeing in this respect. But in the Rig-Veda the sun is called the eye of Varuna, and this proves to us, amongst other things, the fact that at least substantially Ahura and Varuna correspond with each other, and both originate from the same deity of the Arian period⁷.

¹ I do not know whether this difference between *asman* and *thwāsha*, an outer and inner heaven, can be recognized as early as in the Avesta. It must be observed that here the former also is said to be star-covered, which certainly contradicts the later belief.

² 'South-wind' *dashināt-hacha* Vd. III, 42; 'North-west wind' *aparō* (lying behind)-*apākhtarō* (northern)-*vātō* Yt. III, 17; vide p. 141 of OKA, note 3. Similarly *pouru-apākhtara*. Hence Mithra, the yazata of light, closely connected with the wandering sun, is said to drive along the right side of the earth, that is to say, on the southern part of the sky. Yt. X, 99.

³ *Ushastara* (from *ushayh*=Skr. *ushas*); *daoshatara* (from *daosha*=*doshū* 'evening'); *apākhtara* (from *apa*+*akhtara* 'star'); *rapithwa* Vd. II, 10 (*rapithwītara-naēma* Afr. III, 6; Yt. XXII, 7).

⁴ *Hvare*=Skr. *svar*, *sūrya*; *hvare-khshaztem*—N. Pers. *khurshēd*. Spiegel, E.A. vol. ii, p. 66.

⁵ Ys. VI, 3. In the last line of this verse, I think, *naēdha-paitishtiām-vidheñti* must be read.

⁶ Ys. I, 11, *hvarecha-khshaztahē aurvat-aspahē. dōithrahē Ahurahē Mazdāo*.

⁷ Rv. I, 50, 6; I, 115, 1; VI, 51, 1; VII, 63, 1.—Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 43 seq., particularly p. 50.

The sun is also called the body of Ahura Mazda. God is essentially light itself. Him the human eye cannot perceive, but it can see the sun, in which the light is embodied¹. No special explanation is necessary wherever the sun appears as the enemy of thieves and heretics, and similar wicked beings, that love deeds of gloom and darkness².

The daily journey of the sun round about the heavenly vault from East to West made of course a deep impression on the minds of the old Irānians. It was a superhuman, a divine operation. He was, therefore, thought, especially among the common people, to be a bright-sparkling chariot, drawn by heavenly horses³.

Mithra also, the *yazata* of the rising daylight, rides on horses and chariots. Four bright horses are yoked to his car. So he mounts over the bordering eastern mountain ranges, the *Hara-berzati*, and first embracing with his light the highest summits, he irradiates the whole Arian land.

The notion that the *yazatas* of the sun and light drive in chariots, must be traced to the remotest antiquity. I will only mention Eos and Helios, and will recall to your minds the Indian myths. Both Aṣvins, the light-bearers of the morning, the sons of heaven, ride on horses. A splendidly decorated car drawn by white horses and oxen carries up to heaven the Ushas, or Dawn, until at length the Sūrya, the flaming god of the sun, appears himself every day driving his light-coloured horses along the wide vault of heaven⁴.

A friendship, a closer connection, exists between the Sun and the Moon⁵. If that is the star of the day, this is the luminary of the night. Her waxing and waning is the most striking phenomenon connected with the moon. Fifteen days, it is said, the moon grows, and fifteen days she diminishes⁶. Speaking correctly, the time from one phase of the moon to the return of the same phase is known to amount to twenty-nine days and twelve and three-quarter hours (the synodical month). The Avesta, therefore, distinguishes between full-moon and new-moon⁷. That is certainly the most primitive form of chronology, which combines the calculation by days with the calculation by the changes of the moon. The time which elapses between two consecutive full-moon or new-moon days is fixed at thirty days in round numbers and divided into two halves, the period of increasing and that of decreasing.

A mysterious influence on the growth of plants was ascribed to the moon. When her mild light is shining in spring, gold-coloured herbs grow up from

¹ Ys. XXXVI, 6; LVIII, 8.

² Yt. VI, 4.

³ Hence the epithet *aurvat-aspa* 'with swift horses,' Vd. XXI, 5; Ys. XVI, 4; Yt. VI, 1, XII, 34.

⁴ Kaegi, *Der Rig-veda* p. 35 seq.

⁵ Moon *maogh*;—*yāzdi.hakhdhremcha.yat.asti.hakhdhrehnām.vahishtem.aṣṭare.māo-ghemcha.hvarecha*. Yt. VI, 5. About the veneration of the moon vide Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. ii, p. 70.

⁶ Yt. VII, 2.

⁷ *Aṣṭarr-māoghāoscha.perenū-māoghāoscha*, Yt. VII, 4.

the earth¹. It may be that the epithet 'containing cattle-seed²,' which is often applied to the moon, denotes an analogous influence on the fertility and increase of herds. The later tradition, it is true, explains the name in a rationalistic way by relating that, after the death of the primeval ox, the moon preserved his seed and procreated by means of it the different kinds of cattle.

The Stars in their regular unchangeable course are the very prototype of cosmic order. For this reason they are said to be the garment of Asha-vahishta, the genius of the order of the world.³

The planets are reputed wicked hurtful stars, since they seem to mar the cosmic order. The army of fixed stars is arrayed in the sky to fight them. That the spirits of dead men were brought into contact with the stars has been stated already before.

The most important and powerful stars or constellations are Tishtrya, Satavaisa, the Pleiades, and the star Vanat 'the victorious.' The first is reckoned lord of the Eastern quarter of the heavens, the second lord of the West, the third of the North, and the fourth of the South. The Pleiades are seldom mentioned in the Avesta⁴; in the later Scriptures of the Parsees they appear as the noblest and first of all constellations⁵. Corresponding with them is the Vanat, that dominates the southern sky. I take it to be Fomalhaut in the constellation Pisces. It is believed to be the chief enemy of the Khrafstra, the whole verminkind, which were created by the Evil Spirit for the punishment of man⁶.

Tishtrya is, beyond all doubt, Sirius, the dog-star. Plutarch bears testimony that it was held in high veneration by the Persians⁷. It is the 'first' of all constellations⁸, the brilliant, bright star, that does not remain visible to the eye during the whole year. We shall best understand the Tishtrya-myths by calling to mind the times at which Sirius rises and sets.

In latitude 38° North—approximately the latitude of Moru (Merv)—the following are the results obtained for Sirius in the year 1000 before Christ⁹:

- 1st, May, rises : 8h. 50m. forenoon ; sets : 6h. 54m. evening.
- 1st June, rises 6h. 50m. forenoon ; sets : 4h. 54m. afternoon.
- 1st July, rises 4h. 50m. forenoon ; sets 2h. 54m. afternoon.
- 1st August, rises 2h. 50m. night ; sets : 12h. 54m. mid-day.
- 1st September, rises : 12h. 50m. night ; sets : 10h. 54m. forenoon &c.

¹ Yt. VII, 4. ² *Gao-chithra*, Yt. VII, 1, 3, &c. ³ Yt. III, 1.

⁴ Yt. XII, 28, XIII, 60 ; *hapto-irīṣga*—(*sapta*) *ṛkshāh* in the Rig-veda.

⁵ So in *Mkh.* ; cf. also Spiegel, *E.A.*, vol. ii, p. 74, note 1.

⁶ Cf. Yt. 20.

⁷ *De Iside* 47;

I here renounce the quite erroneous identification of Tishtrya with the Morning-star (*vide my Handbuch*, p. 134).

⁸ *Poirya*—Yt. VIII, 12, if this does not designate a peculiar star.

⁹ I owe these calculations to the kindness of Professor Noether, of Erlangen.

Thus Sirius rises, between June and July, at the same time with the sun, becomes first visible in the morning sky towards the end of July, appears in August before sunrise in full brightness, and remains visible the whole night during November.

Quite similar results appear at the same latitude for the year 650 before Christ ; but Sirius stays 4 minutes longer above the horizon ; it rises, in general, later by 13 minutes and sets 17 minutes later :

1st May, rises : 9h. 3m. forenoon ; sets : 7h. 11m. evening.

1st June, rises : 7h. 3m. forenoon ; sets : 5h. 11m. evening.

1st July, rises : 5h. 3m. forenoon ; sets 3h. 11m. afternoon.

1st August, rises : 3h. 3m. forenoon ; sets : 1h. 11m. afternoon.

1st September, rises : 1h. 3m. night ; sets : 11h. 11m. midday.

1st December, rises : 7h. 3m. evening ; sets : 5h. 11m. morning.

In the calendar of the Avesta to Tishtrya is dedicated the fourth month, which falls between June and July, exactly during the time in which Sirius rises together with the sun. Under these circumstances the insertion of the Tishtrya-month cannot be regarded as a mere accident ¹.

The veneration of Sirius which, being the brightest star in the Northern sky, attracted at all times the attention of man, is apparently founded on the fact, that it shines in the firmament just at the time of the greatest solar heat, and that this heat diminishes in proportion as Sirius remains longer above the horizon, and as the time of his rising advances. This coincidence was in course of time looked upon as that of cause and effect. Sirius is reputed an adversary of the demons, who create the insupportable heat of the Irânian summer. From this star the enlivening rains are expected. Men and beasts await and yearn for its coming ²:

‘To Tishtrya, the bright sparkling star, we bring veneration :

‘Whom the waters remember, stagnant and flowing waters, they that are in fountains and streams, the raining and pond-waters.

‘When will arise for us Tishtrya, the shining, sparkling ? When will the horse-strong fountains abound with running waters ?

‘The beauteous ; that over lands and fields and over meadows are streaming. Then the sprouts of herbs will rise with vigorous growth ³’.

The central point of the Tishtrya-myth is his combat against the demon Apausha ‘the burner.’ Ten nights, so runs the legend ⁴, Tishtrya makes his appearance in the shape of a youth of fifteen, ten nights in the shape of a gold-horned bull, and ten nights in that of a fallow-horse. Then his adversary Apausha comes to meet him in the form of a black horse, hairless on his tail, back and ears. Three days and three nights they fight with each other. At

¹ Cf. Roth, *ZdämG.* vol. xxxiv, p. 713.

² Yt. VIII, 48 ; Cf. Yt. VIII, 5.

³ Yt. VIII, 41-42. Geldner, *Metrik*, § 96. I have accepted Geldner’s correction *aiwighzhārān* in the place of *aiwighzhārem* (variant *aiwighzhārām*) in the second strophe

⁴ Yt. VIII, 13-34.

first Tishtrya is vanquished. But at last he succeeds, with the help of Ahura Mazda, in conquering and driving away his antagonist.

This legend, too, is explained by the real conditions of Sirius. It is not immediately after the arrival of this star that the heat diminishes; on the contrary, just at this time, at the end of July and the beginning of August, it reaches its highest degree. Vegetation grows dry and colourless, the earth 'bare' and 'black,' moisture is more or less evaporated. This is the time, during which Tishtrya is not yet strong enough to vie with his adversary. Its duration is 30 days, at the termination of which begins the three days' battle, that ends with Apausha's being routed. So the diminution of heat falls, as it does in reality, in the last days of August.

The Parikas are prominent adversaries of Tishtrya. They, too, were represented as superhuman beings and were specially connected with the shooting-stars. Tishtrya, therefore, is said to conquer the Parikas, that fly about between heaven and earth as worm-stars ¹.

The Evil Spirit has created the Parikas, that they may offer resistance to the rain-bestowing stars. One of them is peculiarly denominated the Parika of Scarcity ².

'Then come forth the rain clouds bearing fertilizing water, clouds full of far-flying vapours, that are spreading far and wide, blessing the seven parts of the earth ³.'

This tradition, like the foregoing, finds its explanation in real phenomena. At the very time of the greatest heat, on the tenth of August, the earth traverses the meteoric swarm of the Perseides, and this night particularly abounds in shooting-stars. This phenomenon excited of course the liveliest interest, the more so as there existed at that time no second annual incident of the kind to claim attention. For the November swarm of the Leonides was according to Leverrier's calculation, not before the year 126 after Christ compelled to enter into our solar system.⁴

It was natural to think that the fall of meteors and the heat of the dog-days had some casual connection. But since the appearance of Sirius falls in that period, the antagonism between this and the meteors, or as it is expressed in the dialect of mythology, between Tishtrya and the Parikas, was naturally suggested.

The companion of Tishtrya and his help-mate is the star Satavaisa. They work together principally in distributing moisture over the earth. The Fravashis let him wander between heaven and earth, that he may refresh by the moisture of rain, men and beasts and plants ⁵. Conformably to the

¹ Yt. VIII, 8.

² *Pairika.duzhyāiryā*. Yt. VIII, 51.

³ Yt. VIII, 40. *Urvātīsh* should be read *uru-vāitīsh* as Geldner supposes (*Metrik*, § 57).

⁴ Cf. Peschel, *Physische Erdkunde*, I, p. 114 seq

⁵ Yt. XIII, 43; see above, p. 188.

opinion of the Parsees, he is lord and ruler of the Western sky, as Tishtrya is of the Eastern.

But here arises a difficulty. An explanation may easily be given of the popular opinion, which attributes the government of the South and the North each to a fixed star, according to its course. But how people happened to imagine that a star was reigning in the East or West is less easy to explain.

The idea cannot possibly have had its origin in observations of the general course of the star in question. It must rather start from a determined period of the year, during which this star is seen exactly in the East and correspondingly in the West. One thing must be granted : Satavaisa must be a star that, in its setting, is nearer the equator than either of the poles, consequently between North-West and South-East. Otherwise it could not be called 'Regent of the West.' It is, likewise, true that Sirius rises in the South-East.

Since Satavaisa is in every regard the counterpart of Tishtrya, I must return to it in order to define the latter. The time at which Tishtrya-Sirius develops its chief activity is Midsummer, or rather August. In this month it shines before sunrise in the Eastern sky.

We must, therefore, conclude that if Satavaisa is the counterpart of Tishtrya, it must stand at the same time, the beginning of August, *after sunset* in the West, in order to be reputed ruler of the West. So we arrive at the conclusion that Satavaisa must be identified with the star Antares in *Scorpio*.¹ Rising, in fact on the first of August, between 1 and 2 in the afternoon, it is at 9 o'clock in the evening above the South-Western horizon and sets about an hour later.

But I think that Antares is no fit ruler of the West. At 38 North Latitude its course is too much in the South. Its culmination is only about 26 degrees above the horizon. We would rather give him a power similar to that of Fomalhaut which culminates at about 22 degrees.

The star Arcturus of *Bootes* seems to be more to our purpose. It is on the first of August at seven o'clock in the evening West-to-North in the sky and sets between 10 and 11. It culminates at 74 degrees more or less.

In identifying Satavaisa with Antares or Arcturus, we always observe that at the time when it declines in the West, Fomalhaut is on the South-Eastern horizon, and Ursa Major low in the North-North-West.

But in determining Satavaisa I prefer by all means starting from another point of view. If Sirius is ruler of the East and Satavaisa of the West, both must stand at *the same time* in the sky, the former towards morning, the latter towards evening. So we must find for Satavaisa a star that shines in the Western sky *before sunrise in the beginning of August*. If this hypothesis is correct, Satavaisa and Wega in the constellation of Lyra must be one and the same star.

¹ So West, 'Pahlavi Texts,' part i, pp. 12-13 note.

Wega rises on the 1st of August about noon and sets at four in the morning. So it is visible for a time together with Sirius. Hence results the surprising combination, that during this time Sirius is standing in the South-East, Fomalhaut in the South-West, Wega in the North-West, near the horizon, and the stars Mizar and Alioth, ϵ and ζ of Ursa Major, almost exactly in the North. Thus we have four governors of the four points of the compass at the same time in the firmament, and the whole doctrine concerning them clears up in a most simple way from real circumstances, when we take as a starting-point the period in which Sirius, without doubt the most prominent of the four, shows its greatest activity and efficacy.

We can now understand that Tishtrya and Satavaisa are a closely connected couple. Sirius and Wega are two stars that may be said to relieve each other. When the former first appears in the morning sky, the latter is visible during the whole night. The more Sirius increases in brilliancy and the longer he remains in the sky, the more Wega decreases. Finally, on the first of December, when Sirius rises at seven in the evening and so remains visible all night, Wega disappears only an hour later below the North-Western horizon.

I shall not conclude without mentioning that in the names *Tishtryeni* and *Pauryeni* greater groups of stars are comprised¹. Evidently they are in close correlation to *Tishtrya* or *Paurya*, by which denomination the same star is probably meant; perhaps they are stars in his immediate neighbourhood. We must further remark that the distribution of water on the earth and the fostering of vegetation is not, according to the view of the Avesta, the exclusive charge and duty of Tishtrya and Satavaisa. They are aided in this by a whole body of stars, from which, as the Avesta says, 'the water comes and the plants and the (fertile) earth².'

§ 15. Chronology and Calendar.

In describing the climatic conditions prevailing in the dwelling-place of the Avesta people I remarked that, strictly speaking, they divided their year into two parts only, summer and winter³. Thus it is that we meet with a twofold calculation, by years and half-years⁴. Now I shall demonstrate below that this fact is involved in the whole arrangement of the calendar.

Though the dialect of the Avesta must be supposed to have some distinct name for spring and originally one also for the latter part of autumn⁵, yet these

¹ Yt. VIII, 12.

² *Stārō, āfshchithra.urvarō-chithra.zemaschithra.*

³ [Vide § 21 of OKA.] *Yāre* or *saredha* 'year'; *zyāo* (*zim*) or *aiwigāma* 'winter'; *hama* 'summer.'

⁴ *Naemem.yāre-drājō* and *yāre-drājō* are employed together in Vd. III, 36 and 37; Cf. Vd. VI, 1 and 43; V, 14.

⁵ *Vaghra* 'spring' is indicated by Tomaschek (p. 20) as employed in the Pamir dialects; *zaremayā* (Roth, *ZdmG.* vol. xxxiv, pp. 702-703) means the same. *Saredha* 'year' = Skr. *çarad* 'autumn' (in N. Pers. *sāl* 'year') seems to have also originally denoted, in the dialect of the Avesta, 'the latter part of autumn' or perhaps even 'winter,' because it appears (Vsp. II, 2) as an epithet to *maidhyāirya*, 'the midwinter-day.'

periods of transition are so short in Eastern Irān, that they were entirely lost and merged in summer and winter.

The most prominent phenomenon was certainly the winter with its intense and lasting cold. Winter, therefore, is used instead of 'year' in the dialect of the Avesta. What observations may be drawn from this change of signification and analogous etymological facts in the Old-Indian dialect, I have already said before¹.

The Eastern Irānians looked upon the night as preceding the day. They reckoned, therefore, by nights, not by days. So the above-mentioned benediction of the fire, literally translated, runs in the following manner: 'In merry mind spend thy life, the nights which thou hast to live²!' This fact is of particular interest, since we find it also among the Indians, Germans, and Gauls³. From this similarity we might perhaps suppose that the custom of counting by nights existed in the very first ages of the Indo-Germanic race.

The month was employed to compute longer spaces of time, as, for instance the pregnancy of women⁴. If the weather is bad, it is known that the body of dead people must not be brought to the *dakhma*. It must be kept for a time in a pit, *kata*, and is to remain here *two or three nights or a whole month together*, until the bad weather is gone⁵.

If there is a dead body in any house, the fire must be directly removed from the hearth, that it may not be exposed to impurity. *Nine nights in winter and a month in summer* must pass by before it is permitted to bring it again into the house⁶.

The Calendar of the Avesta has been often, in our time, the subject of accurate investigation⁷. Nevertheless I hope to bring forward at least some new points and so to be allowed to enlarge in this place on its elucidation.

The year was divided into 12 months of 30 days each, every month into two equal halves of fifteen days. The whole month is a period which elapses between two full or new moons (strictly $29\frac{1}{2}$ days); half a month is the time between full-moon and new-moon. That the bipartition of the month must have been a very old custom will be proved below. Yet I think it very problematical to say that the people of the Avesta observed the week of seven days

¹ *Zim*, *zyāo* 'winter, year' (cf. also the foregoing note); see *O.K.A.* p. 144 seq.

² *Tāo.khshapanō*, *Ys.* LXII, 10; vide *supra*, p. 76. *Khshapan* 'night', *ayare* 'day', *ushagh* 'dawn, morning'.

³ Zimmer, *AltL.* p. 360.

⁴ *Vd.* V, 45: *azvō-māhīm*, *bimāhīm*, &c.

⁵ *Bikhshaparem.vā.thrikshaparem.vā.māzdrājahīm.vā*, *Vd.* V, 12; cf. also *Vd.* V, 54, 55, 56, &c.

⁶ *Nava.khshaparem.upa-mānāyem.aetē . yōi.Mazdayasna . aiwigāmē.āt.hama.mā. zdrājahīm*, *Vd.* V, 42.

⁷ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 665 seq.; and again *ZdmG.* vol. xxxv, p. 642 seq.; Roth, *ZdmG.* vol. xxxiv, p. 698 seq.; C. de Harlez, *Bulletin de l'Athénée Oriental*, 1881, p. 79 seq., p. 159 seq. I regret that I have not been able to read the Essay of Bezzenger; I know it only from quotations.

or that it was of any account in the business of civil life¹. At any rate it was of course necessary to use a week of seven and of eight days alternately, since the month had 30 days.

The names of the months are, it is true, nowhere completely enumerated in the Avesta. But those that are mentioned in our texts² agree fully with the list of the calendar met with in the later Scriptures of the Parsees. So we are entitled to suppose that they were known as far back as the Avesta, and to insert them here without hesitation :

1st Month	<i>Fravashinām</i>	Farvardīn.
2nd	„ <i>Ashahc-vahishtahe</i>	Ardabihisht.
3rd	„ <i>Haurvatātō</i>	Khordād.
4th	„ <i>Tishtryehē</i>	Tīr.
5th	„ <i>Ameretātō</i>	Amurdād.
6th	„ <i>Khshathrahē-vāiryehē</i>	Shahrēvar.
7th	„ <i>Mithrahē</i>	Mihir.
8th	„ <i>Apām</i>	Ābān.
9th	„ <i>Āthrō</i>	Ādar.
10th	„ <i>Dathushō</i>	Dīn (better 'Creator').
11th	„ <i>Vağhēush Manağhō</i>			Bahman.
12th	„ <i>Spēntayāō Ārmatōish</i>	..		Spendārmad.

The order of the names is, as justly remarked by Roth, very striking. We should naturally think that Ahura Mazda, the Creator, would stand foremost, that after Him the other Amesha Spenta would follow in the usual order, and finally Mithra, Tishtrya, Āpō, Ātar, Fravashi. I must, however, confess that I have not found any satisfactory solution of the problem, and must, therefore, leave it to some more fortunate student.

Roth starts with the theory, that the tenth month must have formed originally the beginning of the year; thus the names of the other Amesha Spenta are, says he, in their due order, save that succeeding couples are separated by the insertion of the Fravashis and Tishtrya. The insertion of the former, he continues, must be accounted for by the fact that a sacred and solemn feast of the *manes* could not be removed from its fixed place in the year, while Tishtrya had a strong foothold in the time of the rising of Sirius.

There can be no doubt that much is explained by this hypothesis, yet many a difficulty still remains. As yet we know not why Spentā Ārmatī follows immediately after Vohu-manō and Khshatra-varya stands last of all the Amesha Spenta, and certainly there must also be reasons for this fact. Finally we should think it more natural that the feast of the *manes*, Hamaspatmaidhaya

¹ This hypothesis is based only upon the use of the expression *vishaptatha*, which is interpreted by Roth (l. c. 710, note 1) as 'between-seven' and translated by 'week.'

² These are the months *Asha-vahishta*, *Tishtrya*, *Khshathravarya*, *Mithra*, *Dathuō* i.e., 'of the Creator' (*Trad.* 'of the Law'), and *Spentā Ārmatī*. Westergaard, 'Zend Texts' p. 318 seq. Spiegel, *Ab.* vol. iii, 239 seq.

fell in the month of the Fravashis, as the calculation of the calendar demands, rather than in the intercalary days inserted before it.

The day-names are also nowhere distinctly enumerated in the Avesta, yet there is in the Yasna a list of genii completely agreeing with the day-list found in the traditional Scriptures of the Parsees¹. This is no accident. The author of that passage evidently named the genii on purpose after the order in which they rank in the calendar. The list runs as follows:—

1. <i>Ahurahē Mazdāo</i>	Ormazd	..	} The seven Amsha-spands.
2. <i>Vaḡhēušh Manaḡhō</i>	Bahman	..	
3. <i>Ashahē vahishtahē</i>	Ardabihisht	..	
4. <i>Khshaihrahe vairyaḡhē</i>	Shahrēvar	..	
5. <i>Spentayāo Armatōish</i>	Spendārmad	..	
6. <i>Haurvatātō</i>	Khordād	..	
7. <i>Ameretātō</i>	Amerdād	..	
8. <i>Dathushō</i>	Dīn ² (probably)	..	Creator.
9. <i>Āthrō</i>	Ādar	..	Fire.
10. <i>Apām</i>	Ābān	..	Waters.
11. <i>Hvare-khshaetahē</i>	Khorshēd	..	Sun.
12. <i>Māoḡhō</i>	Māh	..	Moon.
13. <i>Tishtryehē</i>	Tīr	..	Sirius.
14. <i>Gēush</i>	Gōsh	..	the Beasts.
15. <i>Dathushō</i>	Dīn ² , (probably)	..	Creator.
16. <i>Mithrahē</i>	Mihir	..	Mithra
17. <i>Sraoshahē</i>	Srōsh	..	Srausha.
18. <i>Rashnaosh</i>	Rashnu	..	Rashnu.
19. <i>Fravashinām</i>	Farvardīn	..	the <i>Manes</i> .
20. <i>Verethraghnahe</i>	Behrām	..	Vethraghna.
21. <i>Rāmanō</i>	Rām	..	Rāman.
22. <i>Vātahē</i>	Vāt	..	Wind.
23. <i>Dathushō</i>	Dīn ² , (probably)	..	Creator.
24. <i>Daenayāo</i>	Dīn	..	the Law.
25. <i>Ashōish</i>	Ard	..	Ashi.
26. <i>Arshātō</i>	Ashtād	..	Arshāt.
27. <i>Asmanō</i>	Asmān	..	Heaven.
28. <i>Zemō</i>	Zamyād	..	Earth.
29. <i>Māthrahē Spentahē</i>	Māhrspand	..	the Holy Word.
30. <i>Anaghranām-raochaḡhām</i>	Anīrān	..	the 'Lights Without Beginning,' i.e. the Stars.

1 Ys. XVI, 3 seq.; cf. Sir. I and II; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 667. Several names, viz. those of the 11th, 15th, 16th, 20th, 26th and 30th days, are also mentioned in the passage of the Avesta cited above (p. 144, note 2).

2 [Rather *Dai-pa-Ādar*, *Dai-pa-Mihir*, *Dai-pa-Dīn*, *Dai*=Pers. 'yesterday.' The eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-third days of the month are dedicated to Ahura Mazda, like the first day. They are, therefore, named from the day that follows. *Tr. note.*]

There must still be added the five intercalary days that are every year inserted in order to bring the solar and lunar years into harmony. They are dedicated to the five Gāthās or collections of holy hymns. The first and the last of them are mentioned in a recently quoted passage of the Avesta :

1. *Gāthayāo ahunavaiithyāo,*
2. *Gāthayāo ushtavaiithyāo,*
3. *Gāthayāo speñtāmānivāo,*
4. *Gāthayāo vohu-khshathrayāo,*
5. *Gāthayāo vahishtëishtëish.*

The list of names of days is in perfect order, yet it must occasion surprise that the day Dathush occurs three times. This might perhaps be explained by the fact, that the month of thirty fixed days of the solar year was preceded by a lunar month of varying length.

If we divide the month into its natural halves of fifteen days each, we see that the first half begins with the day of Ahura Mazda, and terminates with that of the Creator ; besides that in the very middle of each half-month an additional day, Dathushō, is inserted and proves superfluous by its very position. In my opinion there existed at first settled names only for twice fourteen days. As the synodical month had only twenty-nine days and a half, it was necessary that months of twenty-nine and thirty days should alternate. If needed, an intercalary day could be inserted in the middle of the first or the second half of the month, or in each of them, to keep pace with the lunar phases in the computation of time. Nor can it appear at all strange that these intercalated days were dedicated to the Creator.

During the transition from the lunar to the solar calendar, it was natural that the month of thirty days soon became the standard of calculation. The intercalary days had their settled fixed places as well as the other days. Now it led to no practical disadvantage that the month was not always comfortable to the changes of the moon, for it had lost its original value and served only as a convenient subdivision of the year, which is too long for the wants of civil life.

The Irānian year had also its regularly recurring feasts¹.

In the first place, as stated by the Parsees, those days in every month were held sacred which had the same names as the months in which they fell. In the first month the nineteenth day (since it is dedicated to the *manes*) ; in the second month the third day ; in the third month the sixteenth day ; in the fourth month the thirteenth day ; in the fifth month the seventh day ; in the sixth month the fourth day ; in the seventh month the sixteenth day ; in the eighth month the tenth day ; in the ninth month the ninth day ; in the tenth month the first day, perhaps also the eighth, fifteenth and twenty-third ; in the eleventh month the second day ; in the twelfth month the fifth day.

¹ *Yariya. vrataō*, literally 'yearly times.'

To these days are to be added the six principal feasts, the so-called GĀHANBĀRS, which are annexed, as Roth justly remarks, to the different seasons, and their importance for civil life. But I cannot believe that their names were originally the names of the seasons. I should prefer to think that they became such in later times. The names of the annual feasts are :

1. MAIDHYŌ-REMAYA, in the month of Asha-vahishta on the day of Dathushō before Mithra (the fifteenth day of the second month).
2. MAIDHYŌSHEMA, in the month of Tishtrya on the day of Dathushō before Mithra (the fifteenth day of the fourth month).
3. PATISH-HAHYA, in the month of Khshathra-varya on the day of Anaghranām (the thirtieth day of the sixth month).
4. AYĀTHREMA, in the month of Mithra on the day of Anaghranām (the thirtieth day of the seventh month).
5. MAIDHYĀIRYA, in the month of Dathushō on the day of Verthraghna (the twentieth day of the tenth month).
6. HAMASPATMAEDHAYA, on the day of Vahishtōishti, and thus on the last of the five intercalary days¹.

Each of these feasts comprises five days, so that the principal *dies solemnis* falls on the last of them. The feast Hamaspatmaidhaya extends, therefore, over all the intercalary days ; the feast Madhyō-zarmaya lasted in the second month from the eleventh to the fifteenth day ; the feast Madhyaōshma, in the fourth month, likewise from the eleventh to the fifteenth day ; the feast Maidhyārya, in the tenth month, from the sixteenth to the twentieth day. And so, too, the other feasts.

It is possible that the prolonged duration of these holidays as well as their later relation to the six periods of creation, is nothing but an addition of more modern times. The first feast is designed to celebrate the creation of the heavens, the second that of water, the third of the earth, the fourth the creation of plants, the fifth that of animals, and the sixth the creation of man. It cannot be denied that this connection of the annual feasts with the history of creation cannot be regarded as an invention of the priests thus to render the Gāhanbārs more venerable. Originally they were certainly nothing but rural feasts, and, therefore, originated in rural life.

This is proved both by the meanings of the names given to the several feasts, and by the epithets which they receive in the Avesta.

¹ Ys. I, 9 ; II, 9 ; Visp. I, 2 ; Āfr. Gāhanbār, 7 seq. The opinion of Roth, that we have old names of the seasons in the Gāhanbārs, is contradicted, I think by his own etymologies. If *maidhyō-shema* means 'midsummer,' *maidhyō-zaremaya* 'midspring' and *maidhyārya* 'midwinter,' then these names can only denote originally certain single days. That it may be implied from the epithet *saredha* added to *maidhyārya*, that in later times these names came to signify seasons, is quite erroneously explained by Roth. It means 'year,' perhaps originally 'autumn,' 'late autumn,' about the last period before midwinter-day.

Madhyō-zarmaya denotes 'midspring,' Madhyōshma 'midsummer,' Madhyārya 'midwinter' or, more accurately, 'midyear.' The first is called the time of blossoming, the second the time of the hay crop, the third the autumn or winter time¹. Patish-hahya is generally understood as the time of the corn crop, harvest time, and so is fitly called 'corn-bearing'.² Ayāthrema is, according to Roth's ingenious exposition, the time in which the cattle return from the mountain-pastures into the valleys, and the rams are allowed to go to the ewes³. The explanation of the name Hamaspatmaidhaya offers the greatest difficulty. In the opinion of Roth this is the time in which the farmer makes his preparations for the sowing. I would rather adopt the opinion of C. de Harlez in referring this name to the great feast of the *manes* and the solemn preparations for it⁴.

The Gāhanbārs have in Afrin-e-Gāhanbār each its peculiar number. The first number signifies the anniversary on which the first feast falls, each additional number the interval between the feast in question and the one previous. All these numbers must, therefore, make up :

1. Madhyō-zarmaya	45
2. Madhyōshma	60
3. Patish-hahya	75
4. Ayāthrema	30
5. Madhyārya	80
6. Hamaspatmaidhaya	75

Total .. 365

Assuming that Madhyōshma must fall on midsummerday, the twenty-first of June, Roth has made out that the old Irānian year began on the ninth of March, since the one hundred and fifth day of the year was fixed for this feast. If this calculation cannot be said to be absolutely certain, since the assumption on which it is based can be considered only hypothetical, it appears at any rate most probable. Besides, it is quite in unison with the statement of the Parsees, who say that the first month corresponds to March, the second to April, &c.

¹ Vsp. I, 2, *maidhyō-zarmaya payagha, maidhyōshema vāstrōdātūnya, maidhyārya saredha* (vide p. 146 of O.K.A.). Spiegel and Hübschmann have recently pointed out (*ZdmG.* vol. xxxv, pp. 643 and 665-666) that *maidhyōshema* can have no connection with *hama*, and that the *maidhyō-shad* quoted by Roth as analogous to it is merely a misreading for *maidhyōi-shad*.

² *Patish-hahya* (cf. also the correct explanation in Spiegel, *Av. üb.* vol. ii, pp. 7-8 de Harlez, *Av. tr.* vol. ii, p. 34, and Bezzenberger in *ZdmG.* vol. xxxv, p. 643) from *hahya*=Skr. *sasyd-paiti* (as *paiti-pūthra, paitish-payagha*).

³ *Ayāthrema*=*fraourva;shtra*.*varshni-harshita*; the former from *āyāthra*=Skr. *ājātra* from root *yā+ā*; *fraourvaeshtra* from root *urvis* (certainly not identical with *urt*!) + *fra*; *varshni-harshita* from *varshni*=Skr. *vrshan+harez* 'to let loose'=Skr. *vrj*.

⁴ *Hamaspatma;dhaya*.*areto-kerethna*; the former is not easily to be explained, the latter is certainly from *areta*=*asha+kerethna* from root *kar*.

Hence result the following dates for each month ;

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Fravardin | 9th March—7th April. |
| 2. Ardabihist | 8th April—7th May. |
| 3. Khordād | 8th May—6th June. |
| 4. Tīr | 7th June—6th July. |
| 5. Amerdād | 7th July—5th August. |
| 6. Shahrēvar | 6th August—4th September. |
| 7. Mīhir | 5th September—4th October. |
| 8. Ābān | 5th October—3rd November. |
| 9. Ādar | 4th November—3rd December. |
| 10. Dīn | 4th December—2nd January. |
| 11. Bahman | 3rd January—1st February. |
| 12. Spendārmad | 2nd February—3rd March. |

The five intercalary days, 4th—8th March.

The annual feasts are celebrated as follows :

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Madhyō-zarmaya | on the (18th —) 22nd April. |
| 2. Madhyōshma | „ (17th —) 21st June. |
| 3. Patish-haya | „ (31st August—) 4th September. |
| 4. Ayāthrema | „ (30th Sept.—) 4th October. |
| 5. Madhyārya | „ (19th —) 23rd December. |
| 6. Hamaspatmaidhaya | „ (4th —) 8th March. |

We have thus fixed the year as it originally stood in the Avesta Calendar. It is a moveable year ; and, consisting only of 365 days, it must every fourth year fall one day in arrears when compared with the solar year. It is no part of my task to solve the question how this inconvenience was obviated, since I am only obliged to prove the original institution of the fixed year.¹

The calendar of the Avesta has resulted, as one may observe at a glance, from a combination of solar and lunar chronology. I shall now attempt to describe the manner of this combination.

The month of thirty days, employed in the solar year was evidently preceded by a quite primitive mode of calculation from one new-moon or full-moon, to another, or more probably from new-moon to full-moon and again from full-moon to new. This is indicated, as I have said already², by the arrangement of the days, particularly by the repeated use of the Dathushō, which became necessary on account of the variability of the synodical month.

Additional proof of the originally lunar character of the Avesta calendar is afforded by the numbers which indicate the intervals between the several Gāhanbārs.

¹ Cf. Von Gutschmid *Über das Iranische Jahr* in the 'Transactions of the Scientific Society of Saxony,' 1862, 1 seq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, pp. 669-670.

² *Vide supra* p. 208.

Spiegel has observed that all these numbers are divisible by five¹. Hence he concludes that the Gāhanbārs belong to a calendar in which every week consists of five days. However I cannot agree with this conclusion, since a week of five days is rather uncommon.

I am convinced that the Gāhanbār numbers are based on the synodical half-month of fifteen days; this half-month must be regarded as the basis of the whole chronology in general. This I infer from the fact that all those numbers are multiples of fifteen.

The number of the Madhyārya feast seems to form an exception. But even here the seeming difficulty is overcome in the simplest manner, by resolving 80 into $75+5$, i.e. into five half-months and five intercalary days.

The Gāhanbār numbers further show clearly that the year was divided into two half-years :

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1. $45+60$ | $+75=180$ |
| 2. $30+75 (+5)$ | $+75=180 (185)$. |

Probably the half-year was more employed in civil life than the complete year. Being a shorter period it was more convenient for calculations and agreed moreover with the generally known and popular division of the year into summer and winter. This may be seen from the very distribution of the Gāhanbārs over these half-years :

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Madhyō-zarmaya,
<i>Madhyōshma</i> ,
Patish-haya, | 2. Ayāthrema,
<i>Madhyārya</i> ,
Hamaspatmaidhaya. |
|---|--|

It is evident that each of the two solstices forms the centre and turning point of a half year, so that, indeed, the first more or less corresponds with the warm, the second with the cold season.

But we can trace the calendar to a still more primitive form. Since the name Madhyārya means literally not 'midwinter,' but 'midyear,' the year must necessarily have once begun with the summer solstice, or still more correctly with the day next following. Only in this case the *Bruma* (or the winter solstice) forms also the middle of the year.

But since the Madhyārya itself is associated with the number 80, we might justly conclude that along with the combination of the lunar and solar calendars the five intercalary days of the winter solstice have been inserted.

The oldest calendar may be, therefore, thus arranged :

- 1st Month : 22nd June — 21st July.
 2nd ,, 22nd July — 20th August.
 3rd ,, 21st August — 19th September.
 4th ,, 20th September — 19th October.
 5th ,, 20th October — 18th November.

¹ *ZdmG.* vol. xxxv, p. 645, note 2.

6th Month : 19th November — 18th December.

Intercalary days 19th — 23rd December.

7th Month : 24th December — 22nd January.

8th „ 23rd January — 21st February.

9th „ 22nd February—23rd March.

10th „ 24th March — 22nd April.

11th „ 23rd April — 22nd May.

12th „ 23rd May — 21st June.

Here the winter solstice forms, indeed, the centre of the whole year, for the 21st of December falls exactly on the middle of the intercalary days.

The intercalary days and the additional days of the synodical month may both have been dedicated to Ahura Mazda, the 'Creator'; and now we have, I think, arrived at the point, proceeding from which we can explain why the month falling about the winter Solstice was called DATHUSHO.

The whole calendar was, therefore, calculated from the winter solstice, the original centre of the year, it was afterwards put back by 105 days, and, indeed, in such a manner that the intercalary days also were no longer inserted at the time of the winter solstice but before the beginning of the new year. The reason lay evidently in the fact that the official, I should like to say the ecclesiastical, calendar was to be brought in harmony with the popular division of the year into a winter and a summer half-year. This could only be done by putting the winter and summer solstices, which had always before formed the division between the two half-years, almost in the middle of them.

What may have really occasioned this alteration of the calendar, I cannot say; however I am satisfied with having made an attempt at reducing the calendar of the Avesta to its primitive form as far as possible.

Finally, the divisions of the day are still to be treated of.

The Avesta recognizes five parts of the day¹. They are called in due order : 1) HĀVANI, 2) RAPITHWINA, 3) UZAYERINA, 4) AWISRUTHREMA, 5) USHAHINA². The second is, here at least, without doubt midday, for its name serves, just as in our languages, to denote the southern sky³. About, or till the time Rapithwina, Tishtrya and Apausha fight against each other⁴. This it is true, is very strange, since Tishtrya is an astral *yazata*. But the recollection of this fact had apparently disappeared, before the idea was formed. And if the feud between Tishtrya and Apausha symbolizes only the opposition between the cool weather after summer and the heat of summer, the time of midday seems to be very appropriately selected.

¹ *Asnya ratavō* or *ayara ratavō*.

² *Hāvani*, *Rapithwina*, *Uzayērīna*, *Aiwisruthrema* with the constant epithet *aibigaya*, and *Ushahina*. Vide Ys. I, 3 seq., II, 3 seq. (here are also the names of the genii to whom the single parts of the day are consecrated), Gāh. I-V.

³ Vide *supra* p. 198. The name seems to be connected with *pitu* 'food,'

⁴ Yt. VIII, 25.

At the same time takes place the combat between Kersāspa and the dragon :

On him (the dragon) did Kersāspa cook in the iron kettle his meat *about the time of midday*, and the dragon grew hot and began to sweat ; and he burst forth from beneath the kettle and poured out the boiling water, and affrighted started back the manly hearted Kersāspa¹.

Moreover, there cannot be any doubt that *Ushahina* must be *the time about dawn*². In the same way we learn from the signification of the name itself that *Uzayerina* is that hour of the day in which the stars rise, i.e. *the evening*³.

Hāvani comes between *Ushahina* and *Rapithwina* and is, consequently *the forenoon*. This period is so named probably from the circumstance⁴ that in it the sacrificial ceremonies are performed and in particular the sacred *hauma* beverage is prepared. For this reason the Yazata *Hauma* visits *Zaratushtra* at the time *Hāvani*, just as he is going to purify the fireplace. Finally, the time *Awisruthrema* falls between *Uzayerina* and *Ushahina*, and is, therefore, *the midnight*, the time for being watchful and wakeful⁵.

Now we shall see that the genii to whom the single parts of the day are consecrated are by no means arbitrarily chosen, but stand in real, and for the most part clear, relation to the several periods which they preside over.

Ushahina belongs to *Srausha*. He is reputed the genius of wakefulness, and it is his duty at early morning to awaken mankind from slumber and to chase away the demon of sleep. He is aided in his task by his herald, *Chanticleer* (the domestic cock).

Hāvani, or the forenoon, is under the care of *Mithra*, because he is the *yazata* of the rising and heaven-ascending sun. Sunrise seems to have been considered, at least in later times, the beginning of the day, and not midday; for *Hāvani* opens the dance or circular course of day. At an earlier period the night was thought to precede the day, and hence people were accustomed to reckon time by nights.

Awisruthrema is ruled by the *manes*, who guard human kind at this time, and the genii, e.g. *Valour*, *Victory*, and *Superiority*, by whose aid nightly dangers are warded off. Noon, finally, is consecrated to the genius of fire, and evening to that of water.

§ 16. Religion and Superstition.

WE cannot omit in this place one of the highest spiritual gifts of mankind — Religion. The position in which a people place themselves with regard to their

¹ Yt. IX, 11 ; Yt. XIX, 40.

² From *ushagh* = Skr. *ushas* 'dawn.'

³ *Uzayerina* is derived from *uzayara* ; it is used (Vd. XXI, 5, 9, 13) for the rising of the sun, moon and stars (from root *ir* + *uz*.)

⁴ *Hāvani* from rt. *hu* = Skr. *eu*.

⁵ *Awisruthrema* evidently comes from *aiwishruthra*, 'watch, guard' (from root *eru* + *aiwi* = Skr. *abhi-gru*); comp. *ayāthrema* from *āyāthra*.

Deity is without doubt an important phenomenon in their intellectual life and is characteristic of their manner of viewing things.

And yet I must restrict my remarks to what is indispensable. The religion of the Avesta and the ideas connected with the different genii have already been described by several authors. A new and exhaustive description would afford sufficient matter for a special investigation and would at present lead us too far from our task. I must, therefore, content myself with touching upon some peculiarities of the Avesta religion, illustrative of its spirit and intrinsic excellence.

In comparing the religion of the Avesta with that of the closely related Vedic Indians, a radical difference will force itself upon our observation.¹

¹ [Compare the following remarks of Mr. William D. Whitney, (Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College) in his Chapter on 'The Avesta.' *Vide* 'Oriental and Linguistic Studies,' p. 191 :

'The Zoroastrian religion is one of the most prominent among the forms of belief which have prevailed upon the earth, by reason both of the influence which it has exerted and of its own intrinsic character . . . The later Jewish faith is believed by many to exhibit evident traces of Zoroastrian doctrines, borrowed during the captivity in Babylonia; and the creeds of some Oriental Christian sects, as well as of a portion of the adherents of Islam, have derived essential features from the same source. But the influence which its position only gave it the opportunity of exercising, was assured to it by its own exalted character. Of all the religions of Indo-European origin, of all the religions of the ancient gentle world, it may fairly be claimed to have been the most noble and worthy of admiration, for the depth of its philosophy, the spirituality of its views and doctrines, and the purity of its morality. Valuable notices respecting it had been given by the classical writers, yet they had been altogether insufficient to convey a clear view even of its then conditions in the western provinces to which it had spread much less to illustrate its origin, and the history of its development in the land of its birth. Had the Avesta no other merit than that of laying before us a full picture of the ancient Persian religion, it would be a document of incalculable value to the student of antiquity.'

Also compare Rev. Dr. Mitchell on the merits of Zoroastrianism, in his short tract on 'The Zend-Avesta,' pp. 49-50 :

'There are several characteristics which entitle the Zoroastrian faith to a high place among Gentile systems of religion. (1) It ascribes no immoral attributes to the object of worship. Ahura Mazda, the supreme divinity, stands ethically much higher than the popular gods of Pagan nations generally. The Avesta, as we have seen, retains, much of nature-worship; but evil qualities are never ascribed either to the physical object or the being who presides over it. (2) The Avesta, sanctions no immoral acts as a part of worship. (3) None of the prescribed forms of worship is marked by cruelty. (4) In the great contest between light and darkness, the Avesta exhorts the true worshipper not to remain passive, but to contend with all his might against the productions of the Evil Principle. (5) One remarkable characteristic of the system is the absence of image-worship. (6) The Avesta never despairs of the future of the humanity; it affirms the final victory of good over evil.

'In regard to all these points there is a striking difference between Zoroastrianism and Hinduism. It is not easy to explain how the former system struggled successfully against that fatal gravitation downwards, which made, primitive Hinduism sink deeper and deeper in the mire; but the fact, at all events, is undeniable.

'Assuredly, we have no wish to undervalue the importance of the great characteristics of Zoroastrianism that have now been mentioned; and we might point to yet other merits, such as (7) its encouragement of agriculture, (8) its inculcation of truth

In the Rîg-veda it would be difficult to say who appears as the principal deity ; Varuna and Indra are known to be represented as fighting for the ascendancy. And, besides, to every poet that God appears the most great, powerful and venerable, to whom his songs are addressed. To him he ascribes all the qualities and powers which make up, in his opinion, the nature of the Deity. In the Avesta, on the contrary, rank and order are minutely and exactly established.

As the chief of the whole world, visible and invisible, ranks Ahura Mazda. He is the Creator and Lord of the Universe, no one equals him in honour and power. Next to Him rank, as the highest of the genii, the six Amesha Spenta : Vohu-manō, Asha-vahishta, Khshathra-varya, Spentā Ārmati, Harvatāt, and Amertāt. To each of them a peculiar sphere of activity and dominion in this visible world is allotted. To Vohu-manō is confided the protection of beasts, perhaps originally of mankind too, to Asha the care of fire, to Khshathra of metals, to Ārmati of the earth, and to the two last of water and of plants. The Amesha Spenta are followed by the *yazatas*, the great host of inferior genii, among whom Mithra, Anāhita, and others are prominent.

With the same systematic accuracy and uniformity is the empire of the evil spirits organized. The first of the demons, the counterpart of Ahura in everything, is Angra Manyu, who is all death. Round him are grouped, next in order, the six Arch-daivas, who, sometimes in their very names, are opposed to the Amesha Spenta. The widest circle is formed by the great army of minor demons and infernal fiends.

Thus the whole spiritual world is divided into two great equally organized parties, the party of light and good, and that of darkness and evil. Nevertheless, we cannot speak of a proper dualism, since though both spirits, the good and the evil, co-exist from the beginning¹, yet according to the doctrine of the Avesta, the latter will succumb in the decisive battle at the end of the world.²

Like the invisible world, the visible is also divided between two diametrically opposite parties. Every man is either good or bad, every animal a creature either of light or of darkness ; even more, in nearly every object there is a combination of both powers. Such a separation was suggested in Irān by external³ circumstances ; the extraordinarily great differences of the climate, the sudden transitions from cold to heat, the immediate proximity of fertile fields and deserts, and even historical and social separation into nomad hordes and

in thought, word, and deed, (9) the position of respect it assigns to women, and (10) the kindness towards, at least, Zoroastrians which it inculcates.' *Tr.*]

¹ Ya. XXX, 4 ;

'When both spirits came together from the beginning to create
Life and death, and as the world should be at its end

The evil one chose the impious, but to the pious there came the Best Mind.

In Ya. XXX, 3 Ahura and Angra Manyu are mentioned as twins, *yēma*.

² *Vide supra* pp. 182-183 ; Yt. XIX, *ad finem*.

³ Vd. IX, 53-57 ; XVIII, 63.

sedentary farmers. Yet the consistent manner in which this separation is everywhere followed out in the Avesta must be the work of a conscious speculation.

Whatever the religion of the Avesta has lost in poetical strength and life on the one side, it has gained, without doubt, on the other, in moral profundity. It approaches monotheism by far more nearly than the Vedic religion; as it knows one Eternal Lord and God, of whom the other genii are servants and helpmates.

Personifications of natural powers are by no means the ideal of the orthodox Zoroastrian; and though Mithra and Anâhita may have had partisans and worshippers enough among the common people, in the system itself they give place to deities that prove to be mere hypostases or personifications of ethical conceptions. Vohu-manô is, literally translated, *the good mind*, Ashavahista, *the best piety*, Ârmati, *the devoted and devout resignation*; and these names are, in hundreds of passages in the Avesta, employed in their purely abstract signification. These notions cannot be said to have been exalted into real personages.

Since every individual must necessarily decide either for the party of Ahura or that of Angra Manyu, indifferentism is impossible, and every one must exactly know and fulfil the duties which are imposed upon him by the Deity. The less the forms of the divine beings of the Avesta may have satisfied the imagination, the more impression must have been made by its peculiarly moral energy on every heart and mind.

We must confess that a people contented with such a religion lacks fancy and poetical elevation, but it has a highly respectable moral soberness. A nation of this description will produce no great poet, but will attain a high degree of ethical perception.

Before I discuss the Ethics of the Avesta I insert here, by way of an appendix, some words concerning witchcraft, enchantment and similar superstitions which, though existing among the old Irânian people, do not seem to have had any great importance or diffusion. If the whole world be supposed to be full of evil spirits and demons, as in the Avesta, you may easily perceive that people thought themselves menaced and endangered by these dismal powers, and endeavoured to frustrate their baneful efforts. To heretics and misbelievers was ascribed some influence on the vegetation of the earth¹; they were commonly thought to possess evidently supernatural or magical powers. In this way only will it be intelligible that *Yātu* denotes a heretic or an apostate as well as a sorcerer; *Parika* is a foreign, unbelieving

¹ That *yātu* must have meant 'witchcraft' already in the Arian time, is proved by the Old-Indian *yātu* 'wizard,' and the New-Persian *jādu* with the same signification.

woman, but at the same time also a sorceress with superhuman demoniacal faculties¹.

Not man alone, but beasts also were assaulted by these demons; the enchantment of cattle especially was generally believed in. If a bull started or a cow stumbled down a precipice, it was thought to have been caused by demons². Everything bad in this world was believed to come from them. The best protection and shelter against them were prayers. Yet we may understand that peculiar words were thought peculiarly efficacious in certain cases, and regarded as a counter-charm able to repel the attacks of evil spirits. People especially believed that maladies could be driven away by health-giving sayings³, nay, this manner of curing diseases was considered the very best and most appropriate.

But enchanting power was ascribed not only to sayings and prayers, but also to certain objects. The feathers and bones of the bird *Vārajan*, or *Vārenjana* denoting perhaps the owl, were believed to protect against wounds and to lay enemies under a spell so that they could by no means gain victory⁴.

‘Of the thick-feathered bird *Vārenjana* a feather seek to thee, O Zarathushtra! by it fortify thy body and bewitch thy enemies.

‘For if a man wears bones of this fleet bird or feathers of this fleet bird:

‘No powerful ruler can kill him or make him flee; rich honour is brought home, rich glory secured to him and shelter by the feather of the bird.’

§ 17. *Morality.*

Piety in thoughts, words and works, was the chief precept of the Zoroastrian religion⁵. In it everything else is included; it is the sum of all precepts the doctrine that is always repeated anew, that is, I dare say, met with on every page of the Avesta. He who thinks, speaks and acts well, or, as it is said, according to religion,⁶ is a perfect worshipper of Mazda (*Mazdayasna*) and a worthy follower of Zarathushtra. This triple injunction is a summary of the whole ethical life of the Zoroastrian.

¹ Therefore an evil spirit *Snāvidhaka* has the names *Srvō-jan* (probably ‘killing horned cattle,’ from *sru*, *sruva* ‘horn’) and *aseghōgao* ‘enchanting cattle’ (Skr. *ācas* and *acas*). Cf. also Ys. XXXII, 12.

² Vd. VII, 44; *vachāo.baeshazya*, Vd. IX, 27. See below.

³ Yt. XIV, 35; Geldner, *Metrik*, § 142.

⁴ *Humata, hūkhta, hūvaršta* ‘good thoughts, words and works’; united they form *asha*—Skr. *ṛta* ‘piety.’ According to Darmesteter (*Ormuzd et Ahriman*, p. 8 seq.) these three notions had originally a liturgical signification, viz.—Skr. *sumati* ‘devotion,’ *sūkta* ‘saying prayer,’ *sukṛta* ‘sacrifice.’ But I have no doubt that they developed already in the Avesta into really ethical notions.

⁵ *Anumatē.daṇnayāo, anūkhtē.daṇnayāo, anuvarštē daṇnayāo*, Yt. V, 18. Cf. *Visp.* II, 5.

⁶ Ya. XXX, 3; similarly Ys. XLV, 8.

It would be superfluous to attempt proving this from any passage of the later Avesta ; I will put forward here only one strophe from the Gāthās to prove that this doctrine existed already in the oldest period of the Mazdaean community :

‘ The two spirits, that first existed,
The twins, announced to me in a dream,
What good was and what evil
In thoughts, and words, and works.
Of this the pious choose
The right, but not the bad ones ¹,

It affords, indeed, proof of a great ethical tendency and of a very sober and profound way of thinking, that the Avesta people, or at least the priests of their religion, arrived at the truth that sins by thought must be ranked with sins by deed, and that, therefore, the actual root and source of everything good or bad must be sought for in the mind. It would not be easy to find a people that attained, under equal or similar historical conditions, to such a height of ethical knowledge. In some Varuna-hymns there occasionally appear similar ideas of the guilt of sin, and the reconciliation of Conscience with the Deity ; but they are only isolated flashes, whereas we have, in the Avesta, a settled and established doctrine that is, or should be, common to every one.

Externality and work-righteousness are by no means wanting in the religion of the Avesta. Offences can be expiated by punctiliously prescribed rites of expiation, and here it seems, indeed, that more stress was laid on the external performance of the expiatory ordinance than on the internal renewal and purification of the mind ². Even a kind of indulgence is not unheard of. To certain meritorious works is attributed the effect of removing all guilt and sin from him who performs them. Or it was possible to wipe out, by peculiarly severe atonements, not only the special sin on account of which the atonement was performed, but also other offences committed in former

¹ [Comp. Mr. Cook's remarks on the opening chapter of the Gāthās in 'The Origin of Religion and Language,' p. 216 : 'It is especially to be remarked that there is not in it (Ys. XXVIII), from first to last, a trace of so-called naturalism. No phenomena of nature are personified, invoked or noticed. The universe is conceived as the creation, not as the manifestation, of one Supreme Being, who is, however, not isolated, but surrounded by spiritual principles, which embody, so to speak, or vividly represent His highest attributes, perfect purity as Asha, perfect goodness as Vohumanō. Man approaches this Deity, and is favoured by Him so far as he reflects those attributes. No offering but that of a pure good spirit is suggested ; prayer owes all its efficacy to their presence. The seer has one desire—to know the Supreme Being as He is, and knowing Him to communicate to others the blessings of that gift.' Tr.]

² Vide e.g. Vd. V, 26, with which you may compare Vd. III, 21 and IX, 50. Comparably to Vd. XIII, 7 the killing of a *zarimayagura* seems to have effected a remission of sins.

times or unconsciously¹. Nor should we claim too much, nor expect in the ancient world ideas not formed before the time of our modern and Christian culture.

As cardinal virtues of the old Irānian must be considered *truthfulness* and *fidelity*, *charity* and *benevolence*.

The love of truth is praised as a prominent characteristic of the Western Irānian by the Western writers. Herodotus expressly states that the Persians think nothing so shameful as a lie; after which, says he, ranks the contracting of debts, for this reason particularly, that such as contract debts are now and then compelled to take refuge in falsehood². Covenants are sacred and inviolable to the Avesta, those which are pledged by a mere word not less than those which are pledged with hand or pawn³. The covenant is called *mithra*, doubtless after the *yazata* Mithra, the all-seeing genius of the sun, who, penetrating the whole world with his clear light, sees all things, even the most hidden, and so becomes the guardian and protector of truth, fidelity and covenants. He who betrays a covenant betrays the *yazata* himself, and becomes a betrayer of Mithra or a breaker of covenants⁴. This expression is used almost in the same meaning as *daeva* or *drvañtō*, 'the demons,' 'the evil ones.' The strict observance of a plighted word is regarded as characteristic of the Irānian and the adherent of Zarathushtra, and he who is wanting in fidelity and veracity cuts himself off from the national and religious community.

Lying is a creation of the evil spirits, and in by-gone days it was exceedingly powerful on earth. No sooner than after the birth of Zarathushtra were bounds set to it. For he revealed to man the holy religion, the most efficacious weapon against lying and deceit. It is therefore that the demons break forth into the wild complaint: 'Born, alas! is the pious Zarathushtra in the house of Porushaspa! How can we contrive destruction against him? He is a blow (thunderbolt) to the demons, he is an adversary of the demons, he is the demons' enemy! Down tumble the worshippers of the demons, down the *druj-nasush* produced by the demons, down the falsely-spoken lie!⁵

¹ Herodotus, i, 138; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, p. 684 seq. Darius too expresses, in an inscription (H. 14 seq.), his detestation of 'lying,' if the word *drauga*, which is here used, means nothing less than 'revolt, uproar,' cf. *Bh.* I, 38: 'The army revolted and the lie (uproar) increased in the provinces.'

² Vd. IV, 2; cf. also Yt. X *passim*.

³ *Mithrō-druj*. A pernicious betrayer of Mithra destroys the whole land (Yt. X, 2), probably because he draws down the vengeance of the *yazata*. Mithra takes away in his rage, strength and courage from the *Mithra-deceivers* (Yt. X, 23); their dwellings shall be deserted and desolate (Yt. X, 38). The *mithrō-druj* and the *mithrō-zya* are named along with thieves, robbers, &c. (Ys. LXI, 3). *Verthraghna*, likewise, deprives the Mithra-deceivers of their strength (Yt. XIV, 63.)

⁴ Vd. XIX, 46: *draogha.mithaokhta*.

⁵ Ys. XXXIV, 5. In the first verse we should read *hakhmi*, which is strengthened by the manuscript K 5, Bartholomä, *Gāthās*, p. 39; in the last line *parš* must be expunged.

Charity of course was restricted to followers of the same creed. This cannot seem strange considering the great gulf which Zoroastrians maintained between themselves and the adherents of other doctrines. To succor an unbeliever would be like a strengthening of the dominion of Evil. But charity to poor and distressed brethren is proscribed in the Avesta. Their prayers should be heard ; he who grants them not is committing sin. In the Gāthās it is said :

‘ What is your power, and what your riches,
That I may join you, O Mazda, with my deeds,
In sanctity and pious mind
To nourish the poor man, devoted to you ?
We have renounced all
The demons and *Khrafstra-men*!’

In the Vendidad the precept of mercy is proclaimed no less explicitly in the following passage : ‘ He who does not grant the prayer of a begging man will become a thief of prayer by depriving him that made it¹.’ From these words it becomes evident that the Mazdayasna must regard a request made to him as a deposit. If he does not grant it he keeps back, in a certain measure, the deposit, and commits in this way a theft to the damage of the asker.

¹ Vd. IV, 1. My opinion agrees with that of Harlez (*Av. tr.* I, p. 114); another opinion, but too ingenious, is that of Spiegel, *Comm.* vol. i, p. 116.

CHAPTER IV.

ECONOMICAL LIFE.

§ 18. *Cattle-Breeding.*

THE beasts fed and tended by the Avesta people are divided into large groups, herds and flocks,¹ In the first group are numbered cattle, horses, camels and asses, in the second, goats and sheep. The rearing of poultry was, likewise, known to the old Irānians. It is certain that they knew of the cock, perhaps also of pigeons².

The dog must also be mentioned as a domestic animal of the Avesta people. He was their faithful companion on their wanderings and a careful guardian of their herds. He was, therefore, highly esteemed and treated with kindness, nay, even with veneration, by the worshippers of Mazda.

CATTLE.

The cattle, which are now reared in Central Asia and in the North-Eastern parts of Irān, by no means excel in beauty or other good qualities. In the plains there grows only a short and salty kind of grass³. The valleys in the high mountains of the Hindukush are, on account of the exceedingly rugged and barren quality of the soil, less adapted to the breeding of cattle than of sheep and goats. It is true that even the inhabitants of Wakhān and the Eastern parts of the Pāmīr possess herds of cattle⁴; but, from an agricultural point of view, they are in every respect of inferior importance to sheep and goats.

With the old Irānian people things were quite different, according to what we learn in the Avesta. Hence we must conclude that in those times the rearing of cattle⁵ was by far more popular and general than the breeding of flocks. Sheep and goats are mentioned only occasionally without any further remarks. But the cow plays, in all parts of the Avesta, the most ancient as well as the most modern, a very prominent part and her excellence was generally valued and acknowledged.

1 Beasts, as opposed to men, are generally called *pasu*. At the same time this word when used with *anumaya* means 'flock,' as opposed to *staora* 'herd.'

2 Tame poultry are meant by *vaya* in the *Yima*-legend, if this word (Vd. II, 8) is equivalent to *pasu*, *staora* and *svan*, that is to animals which are all domestic. Pigeons may be understood by *vayaṣibya.pateretaṣibya*, which are offered to Mithra together with *pasu* and *staora* (Yt. X, 119), i.e. with other domestic animals.

3 Vámbéry, *Skizzen*, 198; Polak, *Persien*, II, 98; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. i, p. 261; Khanikoff, *Bokhārā*, p. 302; 'The horned cattle of Bokhārā are in a very miserable state'

4 Gordon, 'Pāmīr,' pp. 113, 136. Cows and sheep are, according to Wood ('Journey,' p. 249), the domestic animals of the inhabitants of Shignān, Roshān, and Darwūz.

5 *Gao* 'cattle,' *ukhshan* 'ox, bull,' also *gao-arshan* (Yt. XIV, 7) 'male cattle,' *gāo daṇu* 'female cattle, cow.' *Gaodāyu* or *gaodaya* 'cattle-breeder,' *gaodhana* (=Skr' *godhana*) 'possession of cattle,' *vāstra* or *gaoyaoti* (=Skr. *gavyūti*) 'pasture.' The star-yazata Tishtrya and the genius Verthraghana appear in the Avesta as gold-horned bulls (like Indra, the Vritra-killer, Parjanya and others, in the Rig-veda). Yt. VIII, 16; XIV, 7.

There is double reason for this fact.

Cattle excel, indeed, all other domestic animals in usefulness for a farming population. They afforded to the old Irānian nearly everything he wanted in his frugal life. They must have been used in farming, for drawing carriages¹ and also, in all likelihood, for bearing heavy loads². The milk of the cow was a favourite and an universal article of food; butter and cheese were made of it. The flesh seems also to have been dressed for eating³. Bows were strung with the sinews of the ox, and the manner of working the hides of slaughtered beasts seems to have been known.

Besides, it must not be forgotten that the Avesta was written especially according to the ideas and in the interest of a settled population of farmers and herdsmen. But cattle-breeding really demands a life by far more sedentary than the breeding of restless, migratory sheep and goats. The latter are, therefore, the peculiar beasts of nomadic tribes of herdsmen, whereas horned cattle form the property of settled farmers.

The descriptions of the Avesta must, therefore, refer to a certain portion only of the population, but the real conditions do not completely correspond to the picture as we see it. Although we have no grounds for supposing that cattle-breeding was in the old ages in as low a state as it is at present in Central Asia, yet it was probably restricted to certain regions and to a small portion of the people. Sheep and goats were certainly not less cared for than now, since the country is naturally well adapted to the rearing of them. They were certainly more liked and valued than might appear from the texts of the Avesta.

Natural pastures are not wanting in the country of the Avesta people. They are found in the valleys of the high mountains, nay, even on the Pāmir. Many of them could not be brought under tillage on account of their situation. The desire to profit by them for cattle-breeding was enhanced by the fact that there was no abundance of soil easy to till, and, therefore, even the smallest possible portions had to be employed for growing fodder.

So it was natural that pastoral habits were also developed among the sedentary and farming population who kept cattle as well. As the inhabitants now living in Wakhān drive their herds in summer to the neighbouring steppes of the Pāmir⁴, just as the nearest mountain regions serve in summer as a

¹ Yt. X, 38.

² Perhaps the expressions *gao-azi* and *gao-vazi* (derived from root *az*=Skr. *aj*, and from root *vaz*=Skr. *vah*) must denote the double use of cattle as beasts of draught and beasts of burden. The inhabitants of the Pāmir in our days employ yaks for bearing loads.

³ Vide p. 228 of *O.K.A.*

⁴ Gordon, 'Pāmir,' p. 136; Schuyler, 'Turkistān,' p. 278. Cf. particularly, Wood, 'Journey,' p. 210: 'In the summer, the women, like the pastoral inhabitants of the Alps, encamp in the higher valleys interspersed among the snowy mountains, and devote their whole time to the dairy. The men remain on the plains, and attend to the agricultural parts of the establishments, but occasionally visit the upper stations; and all speak in rapture of these summer wanderings.'

pasture-ground to the inhabitants of the Yāghnōb, so it was certainly even in olden times. A sojourn in the brisk mountain air and the wholesome nutritious pasture could not but cause the herds to thrive.

This system of pasturing has of course no resemblance with the continual and regular change of feeding-grounds, as it was, and is, customary among nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes. Permanence of abode was by no means prejudiced by it. The owner of the farm remained with the greatest part of his servants in the valley and followed agricultural pursuits. Only the *shepherds* or the *herdsmen*¹ accompanied the animals.

On the mountains the cattle remained during the night in the open air; and were only penned in by fences or hurdles². The dogs took care that no thieves or wolves attacked the herd or dispersed it. 'If anybody,' it is therefore ordered, 'wounds a dog that watches cattle, or cuts off his ear or foot, and if then a thief or a wolf comes unperceived upon the herds and carries off ten head of cattle, he [i.e. the man who injured the dog] must give compensation according to the amount (of the damage)³.'

The wolf being certainly the most terrible enemy of grazing cattle⁴ on pasture-grounds, is very justly called the 'herd-killer⁵.' For greater security the herdsmen not unfrequently remained with the herds, even during the night, and the fires that were then lit⁶ served as well to warm their bodies as to scare away these unwelcome visitors.

In winter the pastures are inaccessible on account of the deep snow. Already at the beginning of October the cattle were invariably brought back into the valleys, and now the feast of 'driving in' could be celebrated. It commenced at the same time as the winter half of the year.

It was necessary that the cattle should be sheltered in safe and substantial stables during the cold months and that the necessary fodder be provided.

¹ *Zaotare* 'driver,' Ys. XI, 1; *vāstare* 'herdsman,' Ys. XXIX, 1, according to the very probable conjecture of Westergaard.

² *Ashta* 'hurdle' = Skr. *asta*. Hence Vd. XIV, 17: 'On twice ninety hurdles whose fencings (*harethra* 'fencing,' from rt. *har*) are no longer useful, solid enclosure shall be raised.'

³ Vd. XIII, 10 *dasa* 'ten,' is apparently a signification of an unsettled plurality. 'Herd' is expressed in this passage by the word *gaētha*, the meanings of which have developed, as I think, in the following way:—

Original meaning:

'Possession, homestead, household.'

Livestock, herds, flocks.

Estate, premises, fields.

Animals, world generally.

People living on the premises, colonists.

Below I shall demonstrate the different meanings of this word by quotations.

⁴ *Yatha.vā.vehrkām.azrō-daidhīm.gaēthām.avi.frapataiti* 'as a wolf (*vehrkō*!) that dashes into the feeding herd on the pasture-ground.' I refer *azrō-daidhīm* to *gaēthām* and trace *azra* to Skr. *ajra* 'fields' (Grassman's *Wtb. sub voc.*)

⁵ *Gaēthō-jan* 'beating the herds.'

⁶ Vd. VIII, 94.

⁷ *Avāthrema* see above, p. 210, and also p. 146 of *OK*.

As the Avesta enjoins the expiation of different faults by constructing roads, bridges, canals and divers useful works, so likewise does it order it by the erection of *stables*. Several precepts, therefore, are given respecting the size and fashion of the building, which, it is to be regretted, we cannot fully understand¹. Besides the stables for cattle, stables for horses and camels are also mentioned, and, moreover, pens for sheep and goats².

In order to feed the cattle during the winter in their stables it was necessary to cultivate grass with a view to providing a store of hay. But there can be no doubt that stall-feeding was limited to the utmost possible degree. Grass is considered an object of farming as well as corn and fruit-trees³. Wherever the natural fertility was not sufficient, the productiveness of the meadows was increased by artificial irrigation⁴. The harvesting of hay took place in the month of June, just as in all countries of a moderate temperature. Midsummer-day is, therefore, the time of grass-mowing⁵.

Several species of horned cattle were distinguished. There seem to have been five⁶; however, more specific statements cannot be made from our texts. It would be very interesting to learn whether the *yak* was known to the Avesta. I cannot think it probable from the names by which it is now denominated in the Pāmīr-dialects⁷. The yak, besides, is found more frequently in the territories of Eastern Turkestan, particularly in Tibet. It is very doubtful whether it ever was a native of the Pāmīr⁸. But since it is at

¹ *Nmānem.gavayanem* (a house for cows) . . . *chithim.nisirinuyāt*, Vd. XIV. 14. The stable shall be: *dvadasa.vitāra upema*, *nava.vitāra.madhema*, *khshvash vitāra.nitēma*; according to Darmesteter: 'twelve *Vitāras* in the largest part of the house, nine *Vitāras* in the middle part, six *Vitāras* in the smallest part. Cf. Spiegel, *Comm.* vol. i, p. 342; de Harlez, *Av. tr.* vol. i, p. 224, n. 4.

² *Gavō-stāna*, *aspō-stāna*, *ushtrō-stāna* (Skr. *goshāna*, *açva-sthāna*, *ushtra-sthāna*) *pasush-hasta* (*hasta* from the root *had* 'to settle'). It must not be overlooked that the stables for flocks have a different denomination from those for herds! Cf. Yt. X, 86. In Yt. V, 59 the hurdle is called *pasu-vastra*; see p. 48, n. 1 of *OKA*.

³ Vd. III, 4-5.

⁴ The produce of the meadows is called *vāstrem-beretem* or *vāstrō beretem* or *beretō-vāstrem* (Vsp. I, 9; II, 11; Vd. II, 24). The artificial laying out of a meadow seems to be denoted (Vd. XV, 42) by *uz-dā*.

⁵ *Maithyōshema vāstro dātāinya*. See above, p. 210, and also p. 146 of *OKA*.

⁶ Hence, I think, the epithet *pañchōhaya* (Yt. XIII, 10). Another appellative is *pouru-saredha* 'consisting of many species.'

⁷ It is called (Tomaschek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 32) either *staur* (Av. *staora*) or *dzugh* (from the root *yuj* 'yoke-beast'). In the Avesta *staora* is a collective appellation for all kinds of animals which are driven in herds. In Vd. VII, 41 it denotes a single beast. But here also we must not suppose that the yak is denoted. The passage treats of an *upema*, *madhema* and *nitēma staora*, by which names probably are meant a camel, a horse and an ox.

⁸ Faiz-Bakhsh relates that the wild yak is met with on the Pāmīr (in Yule, 'Essay' LXIV); by Gordon, on the contrary, this is expressly denied ('Pāmīr,' p. 159).

present on the Pāmīr a domesticated animal of exceeding value, it will not seem to be superfluous to say something about it here according to Wood's description¹

The yak is about double the size of an ox. Shaw, indeed, killed in Tibet an old yak which measured 10 ft. from the nose to the root of the tail, and was 5½ ft. high at the shoulder². Its colour is generally black; white ones are rare. Its hair is exceedingly thick and long, hanging down to the ground on its sides. The tail is tufted and its hair extremely fine; white tails, as is known, are greatly valued in India.

The home of the yak is in the mountains. Wherever the thermometer does not rise above freezing-point, the climate is suited to it; in warmer districts it will degenerate and die off³. In summer, therefore, the yakherds are driven from the low-lying regions into the valleys surrounded by snow-capped mountains. The women follow these herds while the men remain in the valley to work in the fields. Now and then they go to their herds and speak with rapture of their wanderings on the mountains.

The yak is chiefly used for riding and carrying loads. Wherever a man can walk the yak may be ridden. It is to the inhabitants of the Pāmīr countries what the reindeer is to the Lapps of Northern Europe. Like the elephant it possesses a wonderful knowledge of what will bear its weight. After a fresh fall of snow travellers make the yaks walk at the head of the caravan. They are then sure that these beasts will avoid with admirable sagacity the hidden clefts and crevices. At the same time they are the pioneers of the caravan for which they make an excellent road by leading the way.

The milk of the female is excellent though its quantity is not so great as that of the common cow. The flesh of the yak is also eaten. Its hair is worked into carpets or cloth.

THE HORSE.

As cattle are the principal domestic animals of the farmer and herdsman the horse might well be said to be of an aristocratic character⁴. He is chiefly esteemed by the warrior whom he serves on his campaigns as a friend and companion in his battles and victories.

¹ 'Journey,' pp. 208-211. Wood remarks that in Badakhshān and Wakhān the yak is called *kāsh-gau* 'ox of kash.' Here, therefore, it is reputed a bovine animal.

² *Reise*, p. 75.

³ Wood relates that he bought a yak in Ishkāshim for Dr. Lord, and sent it to Kunduz under the care of two trustworthy men. Though it was still winter, the yak died on the way. Several years before a nobleman of Afghānistān succeeded in bringing two yaks as far as Cabul. But here also the climate was not cold enough. They died in the beginning of spring. At present, it is true, domesticated yaks of Chinese origin are to be met with in our Zoological Gardens.

⁴ The 'horse' is plainly *aspa*. The station is called *aspa-arsha* = Skr. *aśva-ṛśhā*, the mare *aspi* or *aspa-daenu*. A special or, as it seems, more poetical expression is *erenava* (Ys. IX, 22). It is translated into Pahlavi by *asp*, and certainly signifies 'runner.' Geldner (*Metrik* pp. 130-131) believes *erenava* to be the prize given in chariot-races,

Hence the word *aspa* 'horse' is in the Avesta dialect of frequent use in the formation of proper names. These names mostly denote personifications of the legendary heroes of Eastern Irān. I mention *Erzrāspa* 'having ruddy, horses' *Kersāspa* 'having lean horses' *Arvataspa* 'master of warlike horses', *Hitāspa* 'driving harnessed horses', *Huaspa* 'having good horses' and so on. There might be added a number of similarly formed names from Western Irān transmitted in Oriental writings as Prexaspes, Sataspes, Hystaspes.

The horses serve not only men but also [*figuratively*] the celestial *yazatas*. *Apām-napāt* the genius of the clouds and the *sun-yazata* drive warlike horses. The car of Ashi, likewise, of Srausha, and of Usha 'the Dawn' is thought to be drawn by [*heavenly*] horses¹. In the shape of light-red horses appear the genii Tishtrya and Verthraghna² sometimes also represented as clear-coloured bulls. The car of Mithra is drawn by horses of the same colour :—

'Whom draw heavenly coursers, red, light, seen far and wide, blessed, active, fleet, obeying the heavenly will³.

The Avesta people distinguished horses especially by their colour. First in order stand the white; besides, fallow and reddish-brown, dark-brown and black horses are specified⁴.

Evidently white horses are reputed sacred, white being the colour of light. Hence they are chiefly used by the *yazatas*⁵ such as Ardvi-sūra. Of Mithra also it is said :

'His chariot is drawn by four horses, white, uncoloured, eating heavenly food, immortal⁶.'

The Persians are expressly stated by Herodotus to consider white horses as sacred⁷. And this custom can be traced also to people of other than Irānian race.

In the Vedic hymns the fire-god Agni is compared to a white horse. White is the colour of the horse which is given to Pedu by the Aṇvins, the Indian *Dioscurides*. In a poetical way the sun himself is called a white horse that carries the goddess of dawn up the sky :

'Bringing the eye of the gods, conducting the white beautiful steed, the happy Ushas appeared, decorated with rays, bestowing gifts, presiding over the universe⁸.'

¹ Cf. the epithets *aurvat-aspa*, Yt. II, 9; VI, 1 and 4; Ys. XXII, 24; and *reñjat-aspa* 'driving nimble, fleet horses,' Gāh. V, 5. According to Weinhold (*Altnord. Leben* pp. 48-49), horses are also considered to be gods by the old Germans of the North.

² Yt. VIII, 18; XIV, 9. The opponent of Tishtrya, Apausha, appears, however, in the shape of a black horse; *Vide supra*, p. 201.

³ Yt. X, 68 and 136. Mithra is, therefore, called *aurushāspa*.

⁴ *Spaeta* or *spaētita* = Skr. *śveta* 'white'; *zairi* = *hari* 'fallow'; *crezra* = *rjra* 'light-red'; *aurusha* = *arusha* 'chestnut'; *syāva* = *cyāva* 'bay'; *sāma* 'black.'

⁵ Yt. V, 13.

⁶ Yt. X, 125.

⁷ Herod. I, 189.

⁸ Rv. VII, 77-3; cf. Grassmann's *Wtb.* under the word *śveta*, Zimmer, *AtL.* p. 231.

The Hellenes, likewise, regarded white horses as sacred. They are chiefly used by light and sun-gods. The Dioscurides ride light-white steeds, and horses of the same colour are harnessed to the car of *Eos* or Dawn¹.

By the Germans white horses were valued above all others; generally they were even forbidden to be used for worldly purposes. They were consecrated to the gods and reared in sacred groves. Kings only were allowed the special privilege of riding white horses².

Not less care was necessary in breeding horses than in breeding cattle. The slightest neglect was regarded as a great offence, and followed by punishment. In the Avesta the horse itself is made to pronounce a curse against the neglectful master :

‘Never more shalt thou harness horses, nor ride on horseback, nor yoke horses to the carriage, thou who askest not strength for me in numerous assembly, in populous companionship³.’

The old Irānian especially the warrior, frequently repeats his desire to possess horses. The warlike hero implores the *yazatas* to give strength and endurance to his team. And the divine beings bestow ‘herds of horses and wealth in horses’ on those that offer sacrifice and veneration⁴. Horses are the pride of the heroes and their dearest and most cherished possession :

‘Thee, O Anāhita ! valiant heroes implore to grant them fleet horses.’

‘To her, Anāhita, offered the Hvovides, to her the Nautarides ; those asked for riches, these for the possession of fleet horses. Soon were the Hvovides blessed with riches ; but the Nautaride Vishtāspa was in our country owner of the swiftest horses⁵.’

Among the qualities of the horse his swiftness is the most prominent. In a poetical manner he is, therefore, classed with the wind, clouds, fog, and winged birds⁶. Next in estimation is his endurance, and, justly, also his keen sight. The stallion is able to see a horse-hair lying on the ground in the most dark, tempestuous, and rainy night, when the sky is covered with clouds⁷.

He is chiefly employed, as already mentioned, in warfare. Joyfully snorting⁸ he draws the chariot of his master into the thick of the fight. He

¹ Preller, *Griech. Mythologie*, I², 335 ; II², 191.

² Tacitus, *Germ.* IX, 10 ; Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, II⁴, 552-553 ; Weinhold *Altnord. Leben*, p. 47.

³ Ys. XI, 2. *Ebenda*, I, vide the curse of the cattle. Compare to this Geldner *Metrik*, § 116.

⁴ *Aspyām.ishtīm, aspyām.vāthwām*—Yt. VIII, 19 ; cf. Yt. X, 3 and 11.

⁵ Yt. V, 86 (*āsu-uspya*) and 98. Cf. Yt. XIII, 52.

⁶ Ys. LVII, 28.

⁷ Yt. XIV, 31 and XVI, 10. Compare with this what is asserted as a characteristic of the horse by Scheitlin (in Brehm, *Thierleben*, II, 354 seq.)

⁸ *Ravō-fraothman*, Yt. XVII, 12 As a charger he is called *aspa-aurvat* or simply *aurvat*=Phlv. *asp-i-kārtzār*—Ys. XI, 2.

is no less esteemed in the chariot race ; for here also he bears the hero to honour and glory.

Chariot-races were without doubt customary among the Avesta peoples. Husrava applies to Anâhita, praying : ' Grant to me that I may drive, among all the teams, the foremost on the long race-course¹. ' Wherever a hero asks strength and endurance for his team, we may consider that he thinks of chariot-races as well as of battles. But the remarks of the Avesta are so few that it would be superfluous to treat of the sports of the people of Eastern Irân in a special section.

Among the old Indians chariot-races were far more in favour than among the Avesta people. In the Vedic period they were carried on with peculiar spirit. Numerous passages of the Rig-veda, nay, whole songs treat of this chivalrous sport. In later times they fell into complete disuse because the people degenerated under the influence of sacerdotal dominion and grew still more unwarlike².

The use of chariots, particularly in battle, was a general custom among the Eastern Irânians as well as the Indians of the Vedic, and the Achaïans of the Homeric, periods. But it was also usual to ride on horseback. It is of course evident that the nomad hordes of the desert never used any vehicle, but always went on horseback. Mithra, therefore, is said to batter down with his club, men and horses of the enemies and to chase away men and horses³. These enemies are apparently nomads, hardy riders who, as it were, grow up together with their horses and conquer or perish together with them.

Here I again call attention to the curse of the horse against the neglectful owner : ' Nor longer shalt thou ride henceforward on horseback. ' In the Avesta the warriors are also said to pray to the *yazatas* ' on the backs of their horses ' ⁴ to grant strength and endurance to them and their coursers. This evinces that riding (on horseback) was known to all classes of the people. Riding was probably resorted to when great distances were to be traversed in the shortest possible time. The journey which a well-mounted rider was able to perform in a day was, therefore, made use of for a certainly primitive standard of measure⁵.

The predilection of the Vedic Indians for the horse and their passion for chariot-races can hardly be explained from the conditions of Indian life⁶.

¹ Yt. V, 50 ; XIX, 77. The length of the race-course *charetu* or *chareta* (Phlv. *asp-rûs*) seems to have been employed, like the Greek *εραδιον* for measuring distances. See Vd. II, 25 and 33.

² Zimmer, *AltL.* 291.

³ *Hô.paoiryô-gadhâm.nijainti* aspaçcha.paiti.vîraçcha* hathra.tarshita.thrâôghayeyiti uwaya.aspa-vîracha.* Yt. X, 101.

⁴ *Bareshaeshu.paiti.aspanâm.* Ys. X, 11.

⁵ So it is asserted (Yt. V, 4) of the canals and branches of Ardvîsûra or the Oxus *kaschitcha.apaghzhâranam*chathware-satem ayare-barâm*hu-aspâi.nairê.baremnâi*, ' and each of the watercourses is a journey of forty days for a good rider. '

⁶ Vide also Roth, *ZdmG.* xxxv, p. 686.

In India the horse does not thrive, as even Herodotus expressly states¹. In later time horses were brought from the country of the Bālhika, i.e. from Bactria².

Here again we surely find in the Vedic culture a relic of former times. This custom originates in the period in which the Arians still encamped on the northern slope of the Paropamisus. Here, in the regions bordering on the desert, the land is, more than elsewhere, adapted to the breeding and training of horses. Here we find the requisite fat pastures and free open plains which serve for exercise. In these regions horse-breeding was at all times cultivated in great perfection.

I will not speak at length of the breeding of the Turcoman horses, whose admirable swiftness and incomparable endurance are praised by every traveller without exception³. It is certain and it is affirmed by national tradition that the Turcoman horses, though on the whole indigenous, have a considerable admixture of Arabian blood. What is certainly of greater importance is that the high value which the Median horses had in ancient times, in the eyes of a part of the Avesta people, was established, without doubt, on Median ground. Special praise is given to the horses of *Nisäa*, which must not be confounded with the *Nisaya* of the Vendidad. They are already mentioned by Herodotus, and Arrian and Strabo agree with his assertion⁴.

The Eastern parts of Irān also are excellently adapted to horse-breeding. Curtius relates that Bactria abounded in good horses. One tribe of the Bactrians seems to have had the name *Zariaspi* 'with fallow horses,' and this name was given afterwards to the capital. The chief forces of the Bactrians consisted of their dreaded horsemen⁵.

Horse-breeding is still successfully carried on in Balkh.⁶ The horses of Herāt are likewise greatly valued. They are small, indeed, but strong and hardy. A great number of them are exported every year⁷. In short, we may justly say that all Irān is adapted to horse-breeding, and that the ground and soil are so conditioned that the inhabitants must have been attracted to it at all times.

¹ Herod. iii, 106.

² Cf. *B. R.* under the words *bāthi* and *bālhika*.

³ Ferrier, *Voyages*, I, pp. 183-185; Vámbéry, *Reise*, p. 368; the same, *Skizzen*, p. 198; McGregor, 'Journey,' I, pp. 267-268; Grodekoff, 'Ride,' 128. So too Fraser, Conolly, Abbott in the compilation of divers notices by Marvin, *Merv*, pp. 162-176.

⁴ Herod. iii, 106, vii, 40; Arr. vii, 17; Strabo, pp. 529-530. Cf. the excursion in Ritter, *Asien*, IX, p. 363 seq. Darius, too, in an inscription at Persepolis (H. 8-9) praises the abundance of horses in his country.

⁵ Curtius, IV, 12, 6; V, 8, 4; VII, 4, 26 and 30; cf. Forbiger, *H. a. G.* II, 555 seq.; Kiepert, *A.G.* § 54 and 59, note.

⁶ Elphinstone, 'Kabul,' vol. I, p. 466. Horses in Kunduz according to Wood, 'Journey,' p. 143.

⁷ Elphinstone, 'Kabul,' vol. I, p. 266; Malletson, 'Herāt,' p. 92. According to Wood ('Journey,' p. 249) horses are rather rare on the upper Oxus. In the upper Zerafshān they are, according to Schuyler (*Turkistān*, I, 278), replaced by asses.

We may assert even more. It is very probable that Central Asia is the original home of the horse, that here man began to compel to his service this noblest of all domestic animals. From the broad expanse of this continent, whose gravelly and sandy steppes afforded a free space to wander in, the horse went down, on all sides, through the high mountains of Northern India, into the valleys of Turkistân, into the tracts and plains near the Oxus and the Jaxartes. Even in our days numerous herds of horses, called Tarpan, rove freely about in Central Asia. It cannot be stated with certainty whether they have returned to the wild state or whether they are to be regarded as the wild sires of our demesticated animals¹.

THE CAMEL.

The camel is found all over Central Asia. In our own days it is extensively reared in the territories which must have been the home of the Avesta people. For the inhabitants of many countries it is even more useful than the horse itself; in desert districts it is almost indispensably necessary².

The camels of Bokhārā are highly renowned. Here, as well as in Khiva and in the other Khanates of Central Asia, both the single and the double-humped species are bred. The latter is especially the domestic and royal animal of the wandering Kirghiz. On account of its great fleetness and hardihood it is employed in the Turcoman deserts for the special purpose of carrying express messengers³.

In Afghânistân, the two-humped camel is oftenest seen. It is also called the Bactrian camel, because it seems to be a native of the districts in the North of the Hindukush and is chiefly found there⁴. The breed in particular request is that of Andkhui, a variety called *Ner*. The *Ner*-camels are conspicuous by the thick hair which grows down from their necks and breasts, by their slender form and uncommon strength⁵.

The inhabitants of the Pāmīr also and of the valleys and tracts on the Upper Oxus cultivate the camel as a domestic animal⁶. The two-humped camel of the Pāmīr-Kirghiz is described by Wood. It is not so ugly as the Arabian camel, but combines with the good qualities of the latter a noble carriage in which it is surpassed only by the horse. A Kirghiz horde consisting

¹ Brehm, *Thierleben*, II, p. 335; Hehn, *Culturpflanzen*, p. 20 seq. Compare besides Middendorff, *Einblicke in das Ferghanah Thal*, p. 264 seq. Mém. de l'Ac. de St. Pétersbourg VII. ser. t. xxix. No. 1.

² An account of the camel and its distribution is given by Ritter, *Asien* XIII, p. 609 seq. Compare besides Brehm, *Thierleben*, II, p. 399 seq.; and especially Polak, *Persien*, II, p. 98; Spiegel, *E.A.* I, p. 260.

³ Burnes, 'Bokhārā,' II, p. 210; III, p. 153; Khanikoff, 'Bokhārā,' p. 202; Vámbéry, *Reise*, pp. 368-369; and also *Skizzen*, p. 198. Schuyler, *Turkistân*, I, p. 130: 'Of course one sees everywhere in the streets numbers of camels.' Middendorff, *Ferghanah*, pp. 293 seq.

⁴ Elphinstone, 'Kabul,' vol. I, p. 227; Stein *Petermanns Mittheilungen*, 1879.
24. ⁵ Vámbéry, *Reise*, p. 213.

⁶ Gordon, 'Pamir,' p. 113; Wood, 'Journey,' pp. 212-213, 246.

of a hundred families, whose encampment was passed by Wood between Ishkāshim and Kalai-Panja, had besides 2000 yaks and 4000 sheep, no less than a thousand camels of this description.

The nomads of Central Asia in particular esteem the camel above all other domestic animals, almost to the point of adoration. We cannot wonder at this when we consider its great strength, patience, and the trifling cost of maintaining it. Fed by a few thistles which are despised by other beasts, it wanders for weeks, nay for months, across the desert without being fatigued. Moreover, it is so docile and obedient that a child is able to govern a whole troop of these beasts by a single word¹.

In the breeding season the character of the male camel is entirely changed. It grows wild, stubborn, vicious and intractable. It becomes dangerous even to its human masters, and there are instances in which men have been bitten to death by such mad camels².

The Eastern Irānians of antiquity kept the camel³ as a domesticated animal as well as the tribes now dwelling in the plains on the Sīr and Amu. It is already mentioned even in the Gāthās :

‘That I ask of Thee ; give me truly answer, O Ahura !

When shall I get justly and rightly my reward,

Ten mares with their stallions and a camel⁴?’

As far back as we can in general trace the culture of the Avesta people in past times, they must have attended to the breeding of camels. Yet the contexts lead us to suppose that in the earliest times the camel was more valued than the horse, or at least was less common.

In the later Avesta the camel ranks, wherever the domestic animals are regularly enumerated according to their value and importance, between the horse and the cow, standing before the latter and after the former⁵. Yet there are also exceptions. For curing the wife of the master of a village a cow must be given as fee to the physician ; for curing the wife of the chief of a district a mare, and for the wife of the governor of a province a she-camel. The latter is here, indeed, more highly priced than a horse or cow⁶.

Camels were no less desired by the old Irānians than herds of cattle and horses. A Tūrānian seems to have been praised for possessing 700 camels⁷. If this passage is urged, it will perhaps prove that the less sedentary Tūrānian tribes, the nomads, devoted special attention to the training of this useful animal.

How much the camel was esteemed in old Irān may be seen from the fact that a great deal of personal names are formed by combination with

¹ Vámbéry, *Skizzen*, p. 54.

² Schuyler, *Turkistān*, I, p. 20.

³ *Ushtra* ‘camel’—N.P. *shutur*. The corresponding expressions in the Pāmīr dialects are found in *Tomaschek*, p. 31.

⁴ Ys. XLIV, 18.

⁵ Vd. XXII, 3-4, 20 : *aspa*, *ushtra*, *gao*, *anumaya*.

⁶ Vd. VII, 42. Cf. also Vd. XIV, 11.

⁷ Yt. IX, 30.

ushtra. I mention *Aravaushtra* 'having wild camels,' *Vôhu-ushtra* 'having good camels,' and *Avāraushtra*, but more than all the name of the prophet *Zarathushtra* himself, and that of his friend and follower *Frashaushtra*.

A full and particular description of the camel, less poetical indeed, but rather circumstantial, is given in the following passage of the Avesta :

'A fourth time came driving Verthraghna, whom Ahura had created, in the form of a load-bearing camel, a biting, swift-footed, a submissive, rambling, a hair-covered, dwelling with man ; that of all productive males has the greatest power and the greatest courage ; that roves among the females ; for those (females) are best protected, whom a burden-carrying camel protects ; a slender, bony, strong-humped, a gay-looking, courageous, a stately, tall, mighty ; that casts up whitish foam towards its head in its courage and its strength ¹.'

Before I finish this section I must allude to a remarkable matter. To the old Irānian word for 'camel' corresponds, in the Indian language, *ushtra*, which is found both in Vedic and in later literature. Here, it has, agreeably to the dialect of the Avesta, the signification of 'camel ²,' in the *Rig-veda*, however, it seems to mean rather a buffalo (or humped ox), as we should indeed, conclude from the context of certain passages.

Sometimes one may hesitate between these two meanings in the Vedic songs ³. Thus it is in the *Dānastutis*, in which the poets praise the gifts with which they have been honoured by princes. Here the *ushtras* are enumerated among the gifts along with horses and cows ⁴. But there can scarcely be any doubt that buffaloes are meant, when the *ushtras* are said to walk by fours under a yolk ⁵. And the same meaning I think correct whenever Pushan,

¹ Yt. XIV, 12-13. The epithets are the following : (1) *Vadhairi*. We might at first recall to mind the Skr. *vadhri* 'castrated,' and regard the *a* between *dh* and *r* as a Svarabhakti vowel. But this suggestion is expressly excluded by the third strophe. I therefore adhere to the explanation of Geldner (*Metrik*, p. 8 n.). (2) *Dadāsu* 'biting,' (3) *Aiwi-tachina*, literally, 'running to and fro,' hence 'swift.' (4) *Urval* 'friendly' 'submissive.' (5) *Frasparena*, from *spar*=N.P. *sapardan* 'pede calcare, viam terere' ('to beat the road by the foot or spur'). (6) *Gaethu* 'hairy' (?)—*gaesu* (see my *Manual* under this word). (7) *Mashyō-vāgha*, from *m.*+*vāgha* from root *vāgh*=Skr. *vas* to dwell.' (8) *Ash-bāzū* 'with strong fore feet.' (9) *Stui-kaofa* 'with high, strong hump.' (10) *Smarshna*(?) (11) *Daṣma-jira*. (12) *Sāra* 'valiant,' from root *sū*=Skr. *çā* 'to sharpen'; cf. German *Schneidig* (sharp). (13) *Rayra*. (14) *Bereza*. (15) *Amavat*. To these are to be added from Yt. XVII, 13 *Uzyamana.zemat* 'starting from the ground,' *ash-manāgh* 'courageous,' and *peretamana* 'warlike.'

² Vide B. R. sub voce.

³ Ludwig, indeed, in his translation of the *Rig-veda*, renders *ushtra* at one time by 'camel,' at another by 'buffalo.'

⁴ Rv. VIII, 5, 37 ; XLVI, 22..

⁵ 'Up to the heavens reached *Kakuha*, who gave me four-yoked *ushtras*; by glory the people of *Yadu*.' Rv. VIII, 6, 48.

chasing his enemies before him, is compared to an *ushtra*¹. For elsewhere in the Rig-veda the bull is the symbol of untamed strength and force².

From the change of signification in this single word we may again derive a portion of the history of civilization. The Indo-Irānian tribe certainly denoted by *ushtra* only the camel. On the northern slope of the Hindukush or still further to the North he may have learned to breed and train this domestic animal. With the Irānian people who remained in the original seats, it preserved at all times its high importance and its old name. But the Indians took the camel with them when wandering into the low plains of the Indus and its five tributaries. Here it must have become more and more rare, because it was not found in a wild state in this neighbourhood. The number of the camels which they had brought with them decreased more and more, for in India the camel thrives only in a few tracts which are specially favourable to its increase, as in Mārwar³. The losses could not well be replaced by beasts tamed anew.

In the Zebu or hump-backed bull which is a native of India the Vedic Arians found a substitute for the camel which continued to die out. Like the camel it became the favourite beast of burden, and was finally known by the same name *ushtra*.

But the remembrance of the camel and its useful services was not lost. Perhaps the species had never become entirely extinct, though surviving only in a few individuals. In a later time it became again more common because camels began to be introduced from the bordering districts of the West. In this way the old name, which had in the Vedic period an unsettled meaning, but the original signification of which had never been wholly forgotten, acquired new importance, and the camel was again denominated by the name *ushtra* as before.

THE ASS.

Among the domestic animals of the Avesta people the ass is also mentioned, though only in a single passage of our texts. In usefulness it stands next to the horse and camel. A female ass is the fee which must be paid to a physician who has succeeded in healing the wife of the chief of a family.⁴ For curing ladies of higher rank a cow, a mare or a female camel must be given.

* * * * *

¹ Rv. I, 138, 2. Here Ludwig (Rv. I, 154) translates *ushtra* by 'camel.'

² In Rv. VIII, 46, 31 the *ushtra* is said to bellow. The word *krad*, employed in this passage, generally designates the bellowing of bulls and the neighing of horses.

³ Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, I², 349. In the upper part of India the camel must have existed in pre-historic times. In 1834 the bones of this animal were found in a fossil state on the spurs of the Himālaya ('Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' 1835, vol. iv., pp. 517, 694, in Ritter, *Asien*, XIII, p. 634).

⁴ Vd. VII, 42: *kathwa-da?nu*. With *kathwa* compare, from the Pāmīr dialects (*Tomaschek*, p. 31), the word *kuāt*, which means 'the coil of an ass' in Wakhi.

Among the Indians of the Vedic time also, the ass was greatly valued as a domestic animal. It was mainly employed for carrying heavy burdens but the male ass was also yoked to carriages¹.

At present great attention and care are paid to the breeding of asses in Persia and Turkistān. This animal is, in our northern countries, not seldom headstrong, lazy and wilful, though there is no reason at all for making him the type of dulness and stupidity. In southern countries he makes a more favourable impression. There he is a fine and sturdy beast, and is besides no less active than enduring².

Particularly numerous and renowned are the asses of Bokhārā and Khīva³. Every year many are brought to Persia, Bagdād, Damascus and Egypt by the Hājis. In Tāshkend they are nearly as common as horses. Here they are of small stature and of white or gray colour; they are able to carry heavy loads. In Khokand, it is true, they are very seldom met with, but on the upper Zerafshān, where horses are rare, they are used as beasts of burden⁴.

It is not at all improbable that it was in Central Asia that the ass, like the horse, was first brought under the power of man. At least the sandy and gravelly steppes of Central Asia are the original home of the *onager* or wild ass. He is a most handsome and swift animal, very shy, and, therefore, very difficult to hunt⁵. Great herds of wild asses roam about near the Aral and Caspian and in the deserts in the North of the Garmsil, according to the reports of travellers⁶.

SHEEP AND GOATS.

We know already that greater value and importance are attributed by the Avesta to the breeding of cattle than to that of sheep and goats⁷. Probably, whilst cattle were the chief property of the settled portion of the people, nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes devoted their time to breeding small cattle, viz., goats and sheep.

The usefulness of goats and sheep was certainly not unknown to the Avesta. Their milk was occasionally drunk, their flesh was doubtless eaten, and their hair and wool were made into cloth⁸.

¹ Zimmer, *AtL.* pp. 232-233.

² Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. II, p. 365 seq.

³ Khanikoff, *Bokhārā*, p. 202; cf. Vámbéry, *Skizzen*, p. 199; *idem*, *Reise*, p. 369. Regarding the Persian ass, see Spiegel, *E.A.* vol 1, p. 260. cf. Middendorff, *Ferghanah*, p. 281.

⁴ Schuyler, *Turkistān*, I, pp. 130, 278.

⁵ Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. II, p. 361 seq.

⁶ Vámbéry, *Reise*, pp. 96, 98; Ferrier, *Voyages*, vol. II, p. 294, and other passages. Cf. p. 98 of *OKA*.

⁷ Sheep *maesha*, ewe *maeshi.daenu*, or *maeshi* alone, ram *maesha. varshni*, goat *buza* or *iza*.

⁸ Vd. V, 52; VII, 15; for cloth made of goat-hair we have *vastra.izaena*, vide p. 224 of *OKA*.

It is easy to explain why the sheep is the symbol of shy timidity. The wolf is its most dangerous enemy. As a sheep is afraid of the wolf, the demons are afraid of the soul of a pious dead person¹.

The old Irānian farmers kept, not only their herds of cattle, but also their flocks on the pastures of the neighbouring mountains during summer. In autumn they returned into the valleys and were here sheltered against the severity of frost and snow in warm penfolds during the whole winter time². After their return at the end of September the rams were allowed to go to the ewes³. The lambs, then, were born in the beginning of March, and were able, when they had passed a summer on the pastures and grown vigorous, to endure the hard Irānian winter with less risk than lambs born in July or August.

The breeding of flocks flourishes in full vigour in the districts of the Sir and the Amu and in Afghānistān even in our days⁴. To a great extent it is favoured by the climate and the natural conditions of the soil. On account of their being so prolific and so easily driven, sheep and goats are much affected by wandering herdsmen⁵. Their transport causes no difficulty, even marches of considerable length are by no means hurtful to them. They easily mount the highest valleys and defiles of the mountains, and even poor pastures, difficult of access, where cattle would starve, are sufficient for their sustenance.

Besides, they more easily resist the cold of winter than cattle, and by no means require such careful and regular tending. The inhabitants, therefore, of rugged and barren mountainous tracts in which the winters are severe and long always rear them in preference to any other domestic animal.

So sheep and goats are the most valued animals in the mountainous regions of Eastern Irān. They are found on the Pāmīr and in the valleys on the Upper Oxus, in Sirikul, Wakhān, Shignān and Roshan⁶. They are likewise the chief property of the nomad Aimaks and Hezāres and of the wandering herdsmen on the borders of the Khāsh desert⁷.

No less valuable are sheep and goats to the Afghāns and Kāfirs⁸. On the way to Kabul, Burnes met with thousands of sheep which belonged to the tribe of the Ghilzāis.⁹ They were being marched, as the snows had disappeared, into the high valleys of the Hindukush, there to spend the summer.

¹ Vd. XIX, 33. Cf. *Aogemadaechā*, p. 19; Yt. XXIV, 27.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 224.

³ Cf. *supra*, p. 210; Roth. *ZddmG.* vol. xxxiv, pp. 704-705.

⁴ In Persia also mutton is in favour and cloth is made from the wool of sheep and the hair of goats. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. I, pp. 260-261; Polak, *Persian*, vol. II, pp. 96-98.

⁵ Roscher, *Nationalökonomik des Ackerbaus*, § 12, note 3.

⁶ Gordon, 'Pamir,' pp. 113, 136; Wood, 'Journey,' pp. 212-213, 249. Compare also Middendorff, *Ferghanah*, pp. 289 seq.

⁷ Ferrier, *Voyages*, vol. i, p. 364; vol. ii, p. 294, &c.

⁸ Masson, 'Narrative,' vol. i, p. 212; vol. ii, pp. 206, 325.

⁹ *Bokhārā*, vol. ii, p. 109.

The fat-tailed sheep of Bokhārā are everywhere known¹. Their flesh is, as Vámbéry asserts², the best he ever tasted in Asia. But it is of course an idle fable to say that the tails of these sheep are sometimes of such weight as to necessitate the animals dragging them along behind them on little wheels³.

* * * * *

THE DOMESTIC COCK.

To what extent poultry were bred by the old Irānian people cannot be determined, since our sources of information are very scanty. They were certainly not unknown, for fowls are spoken of in the Avesta along with other domestic animals⁴. Mention is made of the domestic cock⁵ particularly, which was highly regarded among the Avesta people. He seems to be indigenous to Irān. At a comparatively late period he was brought from Western Asia to Europe; for as late as in the Greek comedians he is called the 'Persian bird⁶.'

Watchfulness and early rising are reputed a great virtue by the Mazda-worshippers. In it they were aided by the cock which, at early dawn, awakens sleepers by his crowing. For this reason he is so highly praised and even held sacred in the Avesta.

The cock is the herald of the *yazata* Srausha, who is active at the early sunrise⁷. With a loud voice he utters his cry at break of day and chases away the evil spirits of night and darkness. The Avesta ascribes to his crowing the following meaning: 'Rise, ye men! praise the genius of piety, curse the demons! If not, Būshyāsta, the evil spirit of sleep, might assault you, who endeavour: to pour sleep on all living creatures that are awake at day break (saying) "Sleep long, O man!"—But this does not become you⁸.'

It is said in another place that the cry of the cock is heard even before it dawns in the East⁹. He calls people to light the fire of the hearth. But then

¹ Burnes, *Bokhārā*, vol. iii, p. 151; Vámbéry, *Skizzen*, p. 196.

² *Reise*, p. 368.

³ Schuyler, *Turkistān*, I, 326.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 222.

⁵ *Parodarsh*, literally 'the foreseer.' He was so called, I think, because he announced and heralded the approach of day by his crowing. The partridge, I suppose, is meant by *kahrka*, for which expressions corresponding with the former meaning are also to be found in the Pāmir dialects (*Tomaschek*, p. 38).

⁶ Hehn, *Culturpflanzen*, p. 277 seq.

⁷ Vd. XVIII, 15 seq. For 'herald' we have in the original text *sraoshā-vareza* 'maker of obedience.' Commonly 'priest' is understood by this word (*Spiegel, Commu.*, vol. i, p. 173). The meaning seems to be that the cock announces to man the time prescribed for the performance of the matutinal ceremonies, as a priest enjoins upon the people the due observance of religious precepts.

⁸ The conclusion offers some perplexities and the text is mutilated. That *hvaṣsat dareghō.mashyāka* must be the words of Būshyāsta, appears from the passage to be presently brought forward. *Hvaṣsa* I think to be the imperative of the inchoative or inceptive *hvaṣ* from *hvaṣ*; but in this case we might expect the adv. *dareghem*,

⁹ Yt. XXII, 41-42,

his mightiest adversary, the demon of sleep, breaks in and craftily whispers to the awaking : ' Do sleep, ye men ! sleep ye, who live in sin, sleep ye who spend your life in sinning !'

With such as did not zealously follow the precepts of the religion of Mazda and especially disliked the commandment of early rising, the cock was certainly no favourite. To the sluggard his rousing cry was not seldom very unwelcome. Therefore, they resorted to mockery and contempt in order to discredit, as far as possible, the cock, whose voice sounded sweet and agreeable only to the active and industrious. The Avesta actually mentions two appellations of the cock, one of them expressly stated to be used by evil-speaking men. Of course such defamation of a most useful and honest animal could not but provoke the indignation of the religious and orthodox Irānian and cause him to denounce such infamy.

One of these names is *Kartō-dansu*¹. Literally, it means 'cutting with knives,' and evidently alludes to the shrill, insupportable cry of the cock. The second name, *Kahrkatūs*, cannot easily be explained; perhaps it must be translated by 'fowl-biter².' It is not impossible that the meaning is obscene.

The latter name, for certain, was already popular in the Arian time. It is also found in the Rig-veda in the form *Krika-dāsu*, and is used here also in a contemptuous way to denote the cock. A poet who is fond of sleep gives him this name in a short song in which he curses in a coarse way everything that might trouble his repose : the braying of the ass, the sighing of the wind or the rustling of the forest, and the cry of the cock :

' Put to death, O Indra ! the ass that brays so piteously !

Chase away with the bird *Kundrināchī* the wind far over the forest !

Kill every one that makes a noise, curse the *Krikadāsu* '³

THE DOG.

Between the manner in which the dog was treated by the Avesta people, and that in which he is now treated by the inhabitants of Persia, there is a great difference. It is well known that he is regarded as an impure animal by Moslems. With the introduction of Muhammedanism into Central and Anterior Asia he has indeed lost all his former dignity and value.

¹ *Kartō-dasu* from *kareta*, 'knife', and *dāsu* from the root *dās*°=Skr. *dañś*.

² *Kahrkatūs*, Vd. XVIII, 15. Darmesteter, *Notes sur l'Avesta*, 20. It will scarcely be possible to separate this word from *kahrka*, N.P. *kark* 'fowl' (cf. *kahrkāsa*.) Indeed we are tempted to see in *kareta* and *kahrka* nothing but collateral forms of Skr. *karna* (formed with suffix *ta* and *ka* instead of *na*), and in *tās* a mutilation of *dās*. In this case the two names might be rendered by 'earmangler.'

³ Rv. I 29.5-7. The *dāçu* in Skr. *kṛkadāçu* corresponds, it cannot be denied, more with the *dāsu* of *kartō-dāsu*. But it proves at the same time, that *tās* may be regarded only as a mutilation.

It is narrated by Schuyler that every family of the Sarts has at least *one* dog¹; but he is by no means treated as a favourite, but rather maltreated. He is seldom fed, being generally left to provide for himself. Their dogs are accordingly lean, weakly and half-starved. They are employed for no other purpose than for watching the houses. By day and night they ramble about in the vicinity of the house, giving the alarm whenever a stranger approaches.

With the modern Persians the word 'dog' is a by-word of the most insulting kind. As such it is employed in divers contumelious expressions, as for instance: 'Whose dog was your father?' or 'You son of a dog!' It may be remarked that a similar usage is found in the Rig-veda, whereas, on the contrary, such forms of abuse are quite impossible in the Avesta:

'He, the god, may choose like a man the song of the pressed Soma;
chase away *the avaricious dog*, as the Bhrigus the enemy!'

'Crush round about *the yelping dogs*, kill the enemies, for you are able to do it, ye Açvins!

Reward every song of the bard with riches, bless ye both, ye truthful,
my hymn!'²

There are excellent dogs in Wakhân. It seems also that they are here better treated, because the minds of the people are not yet fully imbued with the spirit of Islāmism. According to Wood, they differ essentially from the Indian dogs³. They have long ears and a tufted tail, are commonly of a black or reddish-brown colour, in the latter case sometimes spotted. Their shape is lean and more adapted for speed than strength. They are very wild and most watchful, and will attack dogs of double their strength.

In the Avesta the dog is esteemed a faithful companion and friend of man. He is particularly useful in taking care of his master's property, especially by protecting herds and flocks from all damage.

The Vendidad represents Ahura Mazda as uttering the following words:

'I created the dog in his own clothes and shoes, with keen scent and sharp teeth as the property of man to protect his folds; I created the dog as a guard against enemies. If he is attentive and cares for the flocks and if he, O Zarathushtra, is watchful with his voice, no thief nor wolf will come unperceived into the villages to carry away booty'⁴.

¹ *Turkistân*, I, 130.

² Rv. IX, 101, 13 (otherwise explained by Ludwig, Rv. II 512); I, 182, 4.

³ Wood, 'Journey,' p. 246.

⁴ *Span 'dog'*—Skr. *çvan*; a monograph of the dog is the Essay of Hovelacque *Le chien dans l'Avesta, les soins qui lui sont dus, son éloge* in the *Revue de Linguistique* VIII, p. 187- seq.

⁵ Vd. XIII, 39 seq. This passage offers considerable difficulties. *Draonagh* must be compared with Skr. *draviṣas*. I translate *mazu* by 'watchful,' on the basis of tradition which interprets *māshak* as *zināvand*. Beginning from the words *yezi.asti.ash-khrathwa* the original metrical form of the passage may easily be recognized.

The dog is, therefore, less the servant of man than his friend and house companion. Along with wives and children he forms the ornament of the house and a guarantee of its permanence. Numerous dogs are no less desired by the Mazda-worshipper than great herds and a rich harvest¹.

Everywhere the dog appears immediately after man. Of all beasts he stands next to him, almost on a footing of equality. The *yazata*, of earth is offended, whenever dead dogs or dead men are deposited in her lap, and the exhumation of such bodies is a work of the greatest merit².

The dog is sacred and inviolable. It is a great crime to beat, to wound or to kill him. Whoever caused the death of a dog by his neglect had to undergo a very severe punishment. Every damage suffered by herds or other property in consequence of injury to the watch-dog, was expiated in the same way as a sin consciously committed³.

These views of the Avesta completely agree with the narration of Herodotus respecting the Magi, who, he says, kill everything living except man and the dog⁴.

The duties of dogs are various. Hence they are divided into several varieties.

First in rank stands the dog 'that watches the herds⁵.' It is his duty to run round the herd on the pasture in order to scare away wolves and thieves. From the fact that he was ranked highest of all we may conclude how much pastoral life was still affected by the Avesta people, and how they regarded herds and flocks as their most valuable property. The sheep-dog of the herdsmen now living in the Pāmīr is described as being large of a pale-yellow colour, with small erect black ears, black muzzle and thin straight tail⁷.

Second to him stands the farm-house dog 'that watches the village⁶.' He remains near the settlements and has to protect them from the same enemies. For personal safety served the dog 'that goes to the blood⁸,' that is to say, who had been taught to keep hold of a man. Finally, we must mention the dog that had learnt to play tricks and, therefore, was less useful, kept only for sport and pastime⁹.

All kinds are named together in the passage which treats of the killing of a dog and its consequences :

'Whoever kills a dog that watches the herds, or one, that watches the village, or one that goes to the blood, or one that has learnt tricks ;

¹ Vd. III, 3.

² Vd. III, 8, 12 ; cf. also Vd. III, 36 seq.

³ Vd. XIII, 10 seq.

⁴ Herod., I, 140.

⁵ *Spā.yō.pasush-haurvō*. Compare for this and the following statement, Vd. XIII, 17 seq.

⁶ Vide Tomaschek, *Pāmirdialekte*, p. 29.

⁷ *Spā.yō.vish-haurvō*.

⁸ *Spā.yō.vōhunazgō*. Cf. Spiegel, *Comm.* vol. i, p. 176.

⁹ *Spā.yō.drakhtō-hunarō*.

more dreadfully for us and more hideously will his soul wander into the world to come, than a wolf which roves about in the horrible vast forest!.

In a strange panegyric, the tenour of which has little interest for us, his qualities are compared to those of a priest, a warrior, a farmer, a slave, a ferocious beast, a bawd and a babe ! The first he equals in poverty and contentment, the second in watchfulness, the third in activity and restlessness. He flatters like a slave or a bawd, roves about in the darkness like a thief or wild beast, and his tongue protrudes from his mouth like that of an infant¹. In short, he has something of the nature of each of them ; he combines the characteristics of nearly all beings.

The dog is recommended with earnestness to the care of man by the writers of the Avesta. He who gives him bad or insufficient food must expect the severest punishment. It is not allowed to cast before him bones which have not been bruised, nor any hot food to burn his mouth with².

Female dogs big with young must be particularly taken care of. For the lives of many were threatened, if they were hurt by any accident. If such an animal was frightened away, and fell, in consequence, into a cistern or a ditch or a canal, such an offence could by no means be expiated³.

What a contrast between these precepts and the way in which dogs are now treated in Central Asia !

A peculiar purifying power was attributed to the dog. Among other evidences this appears from the ceremony of the *Sagdid*, although the latter has also an idealistic background. Ways by which dead bodies had been carried

¹ Vd. XIII, 8. Towards the end the passage is metrical and may be restored in the following manner : *Khraosyōtaracha.nō.ahmāt*vayōtaracha.hvō.urva*parditi (parō-) asndi.aghvē*yatha.vehrkō.vayō-tūtīē*dramnō.barczishē.razūirē*. The translation is difficult ; that of Spiegel and de Harlez must be rejected. *Vayōtara* and *vayōtūta*(?) are certainly connected with Skr. *bhī*, *bhaya*. Instead of *dramnē* I conjecture *dramnō* (from root *drā* 'to run'). The former originated from its connection with *vayō-tūtīē*.—A division of dogs still more detailed will be found in Vd. V, 29. In this passage *spā' jazhush*, *aiwizhush* and *vizhush* are obscure. With *sukuruna* compare *skōn* 'whelp', in Wakhi (Tomaschek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 29) ; *spā-taurunō* is perhaps the greyhound an excellent breed of which is found in Persia.

² Hence the strange epithet of *hizu-drājagh*. In just the same way the dog is called *dīrgha-jihvya* (Rv. VI, 101, 1). Perhaps the word may have, in the Avesta, at least a metaphoric signification, I suppose, 'talkative,' to which N.P. *zabān-dīrdz* might be compared.

³ Vd. XIII, 20 seq. ; XV, 3.

⁴ Vd. XV, 5. The word used here for bitch is *gadhwā*. It certainly cannot mean 'cat.' In the preceding context dogs only are spoken of ; nor is it probable that the cat was so early known. See Hehn, *Culturpflanzen*, p. 531. Now indeed cats are very frequent in Turkestan and fine specimens are seen there. Schuyler, *Turkestan*, vol. i, p. 130.

were purified by leading over them a dog with certain marks. At sight of him fled away the *Druj Nasush* which had taken possession of the way.

It is known that dogs which have lapsed into a kind of savage state are a plague to several countries of the Orient. It seems to have been so already in Old Irân. At least there occurred, according to the Avesta, instances of men being killed by dogs¹. It was, we may suppose, particularly half-savage dogs which trailed forth carcasses and, like foxes and wolves, devoured the corpses exposed on the Dakhmas².

§ 19. *Agriculture.*

THE combination of the terms 'cattle-breeder' and 'husbandman' is in the Avesta the constant and official denomination of the peasantry³. Thus by the very idiom itself the double nature of husbandry is indicated.

In a like manner the words 'fields' and 'herds' are frequently employed together⁴. Yima, the herdsman of the people, prays to Druvâspa: 'Grant-me that I may bestow *fields* and *herds* on the creatures of Mazda, that I may bestow immortality on the creatures of Mazda!' Then he asks of Anâhita the boon, that he may wrest from the demons riches and bliss, fields and herds, abundance and power⁵.

The nature of the soil in the country of the Avesta people is on the whole more favourable to cattle-breeding than to agriculture. There is abundance of pasture, but the soil adapted to tillage is rather scanty.

By glancing at present conditions we shall be better able to judge of the husbandry of this people in antiquity.

The cultivable and cultivated land in Central Asia is of two kinds. It lies either on the slopes of the mountains or immediately on the banks of rivers. In the former it derives the necessary moisture from springs and atmospherical deposits, in the latter from artificial irrigation.

Thus the rude and barren tracks of the higher mountains are, on the whole, excluded from agriculture. It is only in the wider and more open valleys, as in those of the Panja, the Kokcha, the Herîrûd and other rivers that corn can be produced in considerable quantities, as far as climate and temperature

¹ Vd. VII, 4.

² Vd. V, 3; VI, 46.

³ *Vâstrya.fshuyâs*. The former word is derived from *vâstra* 'pasture,' and represents the farmer as the owner of herds and flocks. But *fshuyâs* is, in my opinion, a derivative of the root *fshu*, which must be connected with Skr. *psâ* 'food' (cf. also *psur*). By food we must understand corn. It is also called *hwaretha* in the Avesta. Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, 654 seq. In Ys. XXIX, 6 the words *fshuyântaêcha.vâstryâêcha* 'husbandman and owner of cattle' are even used separately.

⁴ *Fshaoni . vâthwa*. The former is, indeed, connected with *fshuyat* and meant 'corn, cornfield.'

⁵ Yt. IX, 9; V, 26. Cf. Yt. XIX, 32.

will allow. In the glen-like transverse valleys only isolated parcels of the soil can be brought under tillage. The pastures alone are as a rule of real value for the husbandry of the people in Central Asia.

Low-lying plains and plateaus are for the most part no less unfit for the cultivation of corn. Even along the banks of rivers it is only possible when the construction of waterchannels is not rendered impracticable by the configuration of the land. Wherever the surface of the river lies beneath the bottom of the valley, wherever the bank rises steeply, its waters are often quite useless.

Schuyler says with respect to the Russian dominions¹: 'A map of Central Asia, on which all the arable lands were carefully marked, would be at once instructive and curious; so narrow would be the green strips along the rivers and at the foot of the mountains.' According to his calculations, in the district of Zerafshān only about one-sixth part of the soil is cultivable. In adding the districts of Khōjend and Kurama this proportion will be still less favourable, since in those provinces there are vast deserts. In the latter case there remain only about two twenty-fifth parts of useful ground, in Central Asia altogether no more than one-sixtieth part.

As to the districts in the South of the Amu I have no statistical computation like that of Schuyler for Turkistān. But in reading the accounts of the journeys of Wood, Ferrier, Grodekoff and others, we may probably conjecture that the nature of the soil must be very similar there.

The northern slopes of the Hindūkush apparently contain in their valleys, a rather considerable extent of cultivable land. Even far from the banks of rivers good pasture-land is found; but, for want of moisture, the ground is not fit for raising large crops of corn. This is expressly stated by Wood with respect to the districts lying between Kurum and Ābi-Kiunduz². The plateau between Kurum and Siripāl, which has been traversed by Ferrier, appears to be of a similar nature³.

If soil of natural productiveness were found in abundance, the water of the rivers would not be utilized as was actually the case.

In the upper and middle course of a river the ground does not always allow the turning-off of the waters into channels. And yet a great number of such channels were passed by Ferrier, as he approached the Dehās on his way from Kurum⁴. The river Siripūl, also, has such low flat banks near this town though it is situated in the mountains, that its water can be made use of for irrigation in spring⁵.

¹ *Turkistān*, vol. i, p. 284.

² Wood, 'Journey,' pp. 135-136. The plain between the streams that water Kunduz and Kurum has an undulating surface, and, though unfit for agriculture, affords excellent pasturage.

³ Ferrier, *Voyages*, I, pp. 417-418.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 419.

⁵ Cf. p. 70 of *Ostirānische Kultur*,

Naturally, artificial irrigation is not employed to any great degree before the rivers enter level land. Consequently, some of the most considerable settlements are situated on the very verge of the desert. The flat districts in the neighbourhood of Balkh are traversed by numerous channels, which distribute the water over the whole plain on which lie the ruins of ancient Bactria. This, in old times, caused its great fertility, and is at present the cause of the marshy state of its soil, where cultivation does not flourish¹.

But the water of the river is absorbed by this manner of irrigation to such a degree that it disappears in the sands of the steppes without reaching the Oxus. Yet, even in the North-East of Balkh, there are ruins of considerable extent in the midst of the desert. They are called Siyāhgird². They certainly afford proof that in earlier times the quantity of water flowing from the mountains was by far greater, or at least that cultivation was far more efficient than now-a-days.

What has been said of Balkh is no less true with regard to Kunduz and Khulm, Shibārjān, and Andkhūi, and particularly with regard to the oasis of Merv³.

The situation of the Herirūd is apparently more favourable. Its valley is broad and open, and arable land is found in greater extent even near the middle course of the stream. The district of Haraiva, therefore, was doubtless, in early times, already an important centre of cultivation. The same may be said with respect to the tracts situated to the West on the Keshef, the Atrek and Gurgān, which led the people up into the more fertile fields of Media.

A large tract of fertile ground is also found about the lake of Hāmūn, but the soil is not seldom marshy. It was without doubt necessary to drain it in many places, before tilling and sowing were possible. East of the lake of Hāmūn waterless deserts extend as far as the mountains, only a few strips affording suitable pastures to nomad tribes, at least in winter. Arable land is found only in narrow strips along the rivers Farārūd, Khāshrūd, and especially the Hilmend. But cultivation is here rendered possible only by artificial irrigation.

In the mountainous regions of the Aimāks and Hezāres there is abundance of natural pasture. It may be regarded as certain that agriculture is possible in some places, but in comparison with cattle-breeding it will doubtless remain unimportant.

I shall now pass over to the province South-West of Cābul, between the inner Suleimān range and the Hilmend. It has the general character of a rather sterile plateau traversed by ranges of mountains. There are sufficient pastures; but fields and gardens are confined, for the most part, to the banks

¹ Grodekoff, 'Ride,' p. 80; Ferrier, 'Voyages,' vol. i, pp. 389-391; Burnes, 'Bokhārā,' vol. ii, p. 207; Elphinstone, 'Kabul,' vol. ii, p. 213.

² Grodekoff, 'Ride,' pp. 13-14.

³ Comp. pp. 60, 62, 69, 70, 71 of OK4,

of rivers, namely the Arghandāb, the Tarnak, and the Arghesān. Here also the ground everywhere requires an artificial supply of water in order to repay cultivation.

The mountains of Fishīn are rocky, cold, devoid of vegetation. Even the plateau of Tōba, praised for its beauty, consists almost exclusively of pastures. Corn is grown in small tracts, where the ground can be watered. The Shōrawak, too, owes its productiveness exclusively to artificial irrigation¹.

We know little about the nature of the soil of the upper Karum and Gōmal where pasture-land is certainly abundant; however, arable land cannot be wanting since there is no lack of irrigation. The valley of the Cābulrūd is no less adapted for extensive cultivation. But in the mountains of Kōshistān, Kāfiristān and Chitrāl, the land available for tillage is, for the most part, restricted to the very wider valleys and the more gentle slopes. Pasture-land is here also very common. The rugged and rocky parts of the highest mountains are absolutely useless for cultivation.

With such conditions of soil, husbandry must naturally increase and flourish. It is a matter of course that every spot of land, even smallest, is profited by, if it can be cultivated. As the sterility of the soil is caused by the deficiency of moisture, artificial irrigation is especially employed in a most rational way, and advantage is taken of the water of rivers, lakes and springs as far as possible.

Indeed the irrigation of the soil is carried out with admirable care throughout Turkistān, Afghānistān and Persia.

The Persians evince great ability and skill in their system of irrigation. And yet it is followed by people who have no technical knowledge at all, and whose appliances must be called to some extent defective. We cannot but admire whatever the Persians accomplish in finding out springs, in digging subterranean channels, in dividing and diverting rivers. Hundreds of villages have been created by turning the course of rivers or by separating *one* river into several branches².

The beauty of the aqueducts in the environs of Herāt is praised by many a traveller³. The system of irrigation practised in Afghān Turkistān, especially in the neighbourhood of Balkh, Andkhūi and Shibargān, has been referred to by me on several occasions. Nor is it less certain that the oasis of Khiva owes its fertility solely to the channels cut from the Oxus.

¹ Comp. pp. 110, 112 of *O.K.A.*

² Polak, *Persien*, vol. ii, pp. 116, 119; cf. Ritter, *Asien*, VIII, p. 448; Roscher, *Nationalökonomik*, § 36, note 6.

³ *Vide* pp. 73-74 of *O.K.A.*

⁴ *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde*, vol. vi, p. 407 seq. Comp. Khanikoff, *Bokhārā*, p. 46.

Nowhere, I think, is the art of watering fields more perfect, nowhere is every drop of water turned to better account than in the valley of the Zerafshān. We are perfectly right in stating that here population can only increase if the supply of water increases.

According to Radloff, it might be difficult, even for scientifically trained engineers, to make anything more skilfully than has been done by the people, that dwell on the banks of the Zerafshān. The picturesqueness of the neighbourhood of Samarkand depends entirely on artificial irrigation. Without such a supply of water the valley would be sterile and barren. But now the banks of the river are crowned by blossoming gardens and groves of fruit-bearing trees, by waving fields and smiling meadows, wherein feed numerous herds. And not far from here lies the most dreary desert of the globe !

The system of irrigation adopted by the inhabitants of the district of Zerafshān is described at length by Schuyler¹.

Between Penjkend and the lake of Dengiz into which the Zerafshān flows, 85 principal channels are numbered. Their whole length amounts to 2,500 kilometres. The numerous branches and ditches, which divide from the channels and distribute the water over fields and gardens, are not included in this reckoning.

The first great channel, called Bulungur, branches off near Penjkend from the right bank. It waters the tracts to the North of the river and is one of the oldest in the valley of the Zerafshān.

Further down, on the left side, begins the channel Dargam². This supplies Samarkand and the territory on the left side of the Zerafshān with the necessary moisture.

At the foot of the hill Chupān-ata, not far from Samarkand, the river divides into two different streams. The Northern is called Ak-daryā, 'white stream'; and the Southern, Karā-daryā, 'black stream.' They enclose an island of considerable fertility. Its length is 113 kilometres, its greatest breadth 14 kilometres. Above Katta-kurgān the Karā-daryā sends off the channel Nari-pāi, which returns after a course of 80 kilometres into the Zerafshān near Kermin. The whole Eastern part of Bokhārā depends on the Karā-daryā and Nari-pāi for its water-supply.

The town of Bokhārā and the province in the North of it are watered by the Sheheri-rūd and other channels, which branch off from the Zerafshān below Kermin. Almost all the rest of the water of this river is distributed over the country by ditches and channels; only a very small portion reaches the lake of Dengiz.

At the first colonization of the country the Arians, indeed, commenced with cultivating tracts that were naturally productive. But very soon

¹ Schuyler, *Turkistān*, vol. i, p. 286 seq.

² Vide p. 33 of OKA.

misfortunes, attended with great danger, began to be felt. The rainfall in Turkistān and Eastern Irān is extremely unequal, the success of the harvest is therefore, very uncertain¹. But harvests and times of pressing want and distress must have been experienced.

In the early times, therefore, the project was planned of employing the water of rivers for the irrigation of the fields. The colonists settled on the banks of a river and extended their fields as far as artificial irrigation was possible.

The Avesta people had already no inconsiderable technical skill for irrigation. In the Gāthās, it is true, this subject is not spoken of. We shall see this is to be accounted for not only by the scantiness of the texts, but that it is also founded on the economical state of the first period of Zoroastrian civilization.

In the later Avesta we see that agriculture was highly developed. All the means are already known and employed by which nature is assisted and its deficiencies relieved in Central Asia even in our days².

Both the draining of morasses and the irrigation of arid soil are praised as highly meritorious³. Such draining was indispensable in some regions, as for instance on the Hāmūn; while irrigation was almost necessary in all parts of the country. The religion of Mazda invites its adherents to ceaseless activity in agriculture no less than in other pursuits. It bids them fight against sterility and barrenness, and create instead of them affluence and culture.

Only the cultivated ground is the property of Mazda. Regions devoid of cultivation are haunted by evil spirits. Wherever, therefore, a follower of the Avesta religion settles, it will be his first duty to render the soil productive. It is a triumph of the good cause whenever a portion of arable ground is wrung from the death-like desert. In the Vendidad the genius of the earth

¹ Schuyler, *Turkistān*, vol. i, p. 292: 'Experience shows, too, that the harvests on these (rain) lands are exceedingly variable. Thus, for example, in 1862, the extensive rain-lands to the south of Katta-kurgān, called Chul, produced 1,106,000 bushels of wheat; in 1868: 155,620; in 1870: 486; and in 1871: 12, 430 The great famine of 1870 is still remembered. From 1810 to 1811 there was no winter, and no rain fell in the spring, wherefore the harvest in the rain-lands failed entirely, and there was such a famine that men sold their children, their sisters and mothers, and either killed the old people or left them to starve. In 1835 there was another famine from the same causes, but less disastrous in its consequences, as there had been a remarkably good harvest in the preceding year. In the winter of 1869-70 there was no snow and very little rain in the following spring, so that the wheat on the rain-lands had no sooner sprouted than it dried up.' These facts are taken from an essay written by Grebenkin on the 'Causes of the Bad Harvests in Bokhārā,' published in the *Turkistān Gazette*, 1872, Nos. 17 and 18.

² Terms of agriculture are: *aiwi-varez* 'to work the soil' (N. P. *barzīdan*, *barzīgār*, *barzīgūrt*); *kāraj* 'to beget, to produce (fruit)'; *yaokarshati* (from *yava*+*karshiti*, from root *karash*—Skr. *kṛsh*, cf. *kṛshṭi charshāṇi* 'cultivation of corn').

³ Vd. III, 4-5.

is said to rejoice at the soil being tilled and corn produced, and to mourn at its remaining barren and sterile. The earth is like a woman, who misses her vocation when she grows old childless, but who is proud in happiness and beauty when healthy sons owe their lives to her ¹.

This view will explain why in the Avesta belief and unbelief are so often brought in immediate connection with the vegetable life of nature.

At the birth of Zarathushtra the waters and plants increase. On the contrary, a sinner who has defiled himself by touching a dead body, will cause the pastures to be parched by heat or herds and flocks to be endangered by enormous masses of snow in winter.²

A misbeliever, an *Ashemaugha*, takes away all fertility from the country he dwells in. Only after he has suffered merited death is it that prosperity and affluence, bliss and plenty, will return to it ³.

The prostitute, who mingles the seed of the pious and impious, is said to dry up by her looks a third part of the running waters, and so stunt a third part of the beautiful gold-coloured plants. The attacks of evil spirits are directed peculiarly against the fertility of the earth. The good spirits endeavour to keep off these assaults :

'When the Evil Spirit sought to overwhelm the creations of the Good and Holy Spirit, there intervened, hostile to him, Vohu-manā and the Fire. They both overthrew the enmity of the evil, wicked Spirit, that he might never check the course of waters, nor prevent the growth of plants. At once the blissful waters of the high Creator, of the powerful Ahura Mazda, began to flow and His plants began to sprout ⁴.'

The practical side of the Zoroastrian religion was, of course, of the greatest importance for civilization. What happy influence it exercised in Persia has been shown in an excellent manner by Ritter ⁵. By the cultivation of the ground, the construction of fountains and the planting of trees the rigour of the Irānian soil and climate were gradually and imperceptibly mitigated.

It is certainly not unknown that the last followers of the Zoroastrian religion on Persian ground, the Guebres in Yezd and Kirmān, chiefly attended to horticulture. It was not by the severity of external circumstances alone that they were compelled to do so ⁶. They were in no less degree influenced by their religious precepts and their habitual esteem for agricultural pursuits.

¹ This idea is chiefly made use of in the third chapter of the *Vendidad*, and forms the keynote of the whole passage. Cf. *ZdāmG.* vol. xxxiv, p. 421 note.

² Yt. XIII, 93 ; Vd. VII, 26-27.

³ Vd. IX, 53-57.

⁴ Yt. XIII, 77-78. Cf. Geldner, *Metrik*, § 81.

⁵ *Asien*, vol. viii, p. 275.

⁶ Khanikoff, *Mémoire*, p. 203 ; 'Empêchés par la concurrence des musulmans de prendre une part active dans le commerce et dans l'industrie manufacturière, les Guébres se livrent presque exclusivement au jardinage.'

Artificial irrigation is, according to the Avesta, an indispensable requisite in agriculture¹. In the district of Zerafshān there is a custom of dividing the field into squares in growing lucern and grain which demand an equal distribution of water. They are separated by small ridges a few inches high. When they are filled with water, the opening from the canal is closed and the water is left to soak into the soil².

Probably, in old times as at present, the main channel was first dug. From it there branched off, if wanted, secondary channels and ditches which distributed the water over the fields. It is characteristic of the regard for public utility in the Avesta people, that in the Vendidad the construction of water-channels is enjoined as compensation for trespasses³.

On fields too distant from the river wells were dug in search of springs⁴. The water was then drawn up, we must suppose, by means of suitable appliances.

In the construction of wells the modern Persians show special ability. They combine them by horizontal stream-works, so as to form a whole network of subterranean channels. The water is drawn up in the following manner: the bucket, fastened to a rope, is sunk into the well; the rope runs round a beam; oxen yoked to its opposite end draw up the bucket when filled. In order to lighten the work the team is commonly driven down an inclined plane⁵.

In regions where water was particularly scarce, cisterns seem to have been constructed⁶. The rain-water gathered there appears to have served for men and herds. It was scarcely sufficient for irrigating the fields.

The Avesta distinguishes three stages in Agricultural pursuits: *watering*, *ploughing up*, and *ploughing down*⁷. The ploughing up was immediately followed by the sowing of corn. Then the seed was covered with earth. Of the form of the plough and of the harrow nothing certain can be stated. At present agricultural implements are very simple and primitive in Turkistān. Hence we may suppose that they were no less so in ancient days.

¹ *Nātat.āpem.hiñchaiti.avi.yavō-charānem*, Vd. V, 5; *mācha.paschaeta.Mazdayasna. tām.zām.kārayen, mā.āpō.hatezayen*, Vd. VI, 2.

² Schuyler, *Turkistān*, vol. i, p. 289.

³ Vd. XIV, 12; V, 5. The ditches made for irrigation are called *vaidhi* or *vāidhi*. In the Pāmir dialects (*Tomaschek*, p. 24) is found *wādh*, *wiēdh* with the same signification. A greater channel is called *urudh*, Vd. XIII, 38. The order of the expressions, *maēgha*, *chāiti*, *vaēma*, *urudh*, *āp-nārya*, is to be observed. The enumeration is made apparently from the smallest to the larger. Justi translates 'river,' but this is probably denoted by the last expression. I would refer also to Vsp. XVI, 3: *shōithrya.apascha.zemascha. urvarāoscha*, 'the waters, fields and herbs appertaining to a settlement.'

⁴ *Chāiti* or *chāt*=N.P. *chāh* 'puteus, fovea' Vd. XIII, 38; VI, 33.

⁵ Polak, *Persien*, vol. i, p. 120.

⁶ Such cisterns are probably meant (Vd. XV, 39) by *avakana* (from root *kan* 'to dig').

⁷ Vd. VI, 6: *kikhti*, *karшти* (from root *karesh* 'to draw furrows'), *parakaṇti*.

According to the statements of the Avesta, the irrigation of the soil must have preceded the work of the plough. It was considered a preliminary condition of tilling and sowing. But it was not thought sufficient to water the fields only once. It was repeated two or three times¹. In agreement with this is the actual custom of the peasantry in the environs of Samarkand in growing wheat.

'Winter-wheat and barley are sown about the middle of September, and worked in with a rude harrow. Winter-wheat is irrigated two or three times, barley only once, and the harvest ripens about the end of May.'²

We do not learn anything further of the tasks and labours of the farmer until the harvest-time. Nor can it be stated, as I have already remarked³, what kind of grain was cultivated. At present, wheat is general in Turkistān. In the district of Zerafshān one-fourth part of the watered land is sown with wheat, about one-fifteenth only with barley⁴. The agricultural system followed by the Avesta people especially resembles that which is at present employed with respect to wheat. Yet I dare not hence draw any natural conclusion with regard to the ancient practice.

The time for gathering the harvest was, of course, very different according to climate and temperature, and even according to the season of sowing in different provinces. By the beginning of September the crop was everywhere brought home, even in the coldest districts. At this time, therefore the harvest-feast was celebrated⁵.

When the corn was cut, it was probably trodden out by horses and oxen driven over the sheaves spread on the ground. This method is still generally practised. Whatever was not immediately consumed was preserved in *barns*. The separation of the grain from the chaff was performed by *winnowing* or *fanning*. In the *mill*, the construction of which was certainly most primitive, the corn was ground and so meal was made⁶.

¹ Vd. XIV, 13: 'Arable and productive land (=zām.karshyām.raodhyām) shall be given to pious men in good piety for the expiation of the soul. Creator! of what kind must the land be! Such (? land) as is twice watered.' Vd. V, 5; *ana. tā vaidhim ayāo, anabitim, ana.thrilim; pascha.tūirīm*.

² Schuyler, *Turkistān*, vol. i, p. 290.

³ Comp. pp. 151-152 of *O.K.A.*

⁴ Shuyler, *Turkistān*. vol. i, p. 291.

⁵ *Paitish-hahya*. Vide p. 146 of *O.K.A.* Hence, therefore, we must not conclude that the climate was exceptionally rigorous. How is it possible to lay down a universally valid law for territories of such diametrically opposite character, as Balkh and Kabul, Seistān and Ghazna, the districts of Panja and Zerafshān? The harvest certainly took place one or two months later in the mountain valleys than in the hot plains.

⁶ *Yavan* 'barn' (Vd. XVII, 3); *sudhush* 'winnowing-fan' (from rt. *sudh*=Skr. *śudh* 'to cleanse'), Vd. III, 32; *piṣru* 'mill' (from rt. *piṣh* 'to grind'); *gunda* 'meal'. Schuyler, *Turkistān*, vol. i, p. 290. 'The grain, instead of being thrashed, is trodden, out by oxen and horses, and then cleaned by being tossed in the air.'

Not only corn, but also grass and fruit-trees were objects of cultivation with the Avesta people :

'Creator of this material world, Thou Holy One ! Where, thirdly, is the Earth most gladdened ? Ahura Mazda answered : Wherever grain is mostly produced, O son of Spitama, Zarathushtra, and grass and fruit-bearing trees ; wherever arid land is changed into watered, and marshy into dry land ¹.'

We know that in Old-Irān stall-feeding was necessary during winter. This required the storing of hay in spite of abundant pastures. According to the passage cited above it will scarcely be contested that *grass was grown* ². But it was certainly restricted as far as possible on account of the small extent of productive land. But a portion of the winter fodder might have been also obtained for pastures.

It is a matter of importance that *the Avesta people also cultivated trees*. This circumstance proves that they were a fully-settled people. He who cultivates grain, takes care of his immediate wants, but he who rears trees, thinks less of his own advantage than that of his children and grand-children who shall one day enjoy the fruits of his labour. He supposes that his progeny will dwell on the same land, will plough the same field. Confiding in their love and reverence for himself he will leave them his land in the best possible condition.

I have already spoken about the abundance of fruit in Turkistān and Eastern Irān ³. Persia and Afghānistān, which are more favourably situated, are famous for their splendid gardens.

In his description of the inhabitants of Zerafshān in connection with the subject of horticulture, Schuyler says :

'The gardens are the glory of all this land. The long rows of poplars, and elm-trees, the vineyards, the dark foliage of the pomegranate over the walls, transport one at once to the plains of Lombardy or of Southern France. In the early spring the outskirts of the city and indeed the whole valley are one mass of white and pink with the bloom of almond and peach, of cherry and apple, of apricot and plum trees, which perfume the air for miles around. Nowhere are fruits more abundant, and of some varieties it can be said that nowhere are they better ⁴.'

Little can be stated with certainty as to the system of managing farm followed by the Avesta people. It may have varied in different provinces.

A system of fields having permanent pasturage is best adapted to the conditions of the soil. It is characteristic of this system that the ground is

¹ Vd. III, 4.

² Also in Vd. XV, 41-42 the question seems to refer to artificially laid out meadows (*yδ.aztem.vāstrem.uzdasta.vāstrih*). It is true that Geldner translates 'hurdle.'

³ Vide p. 151 of OKA.

⁴ Turkistān, vol. i, p. 296.

divided into two principal portions, of which one is employed for growing corn, the other as permanent pasture¹. The former lies nearer to the centre, or the settlement, in order to lessen the work in the fields. In Irān it was limited to the banks of rivers, or slopes naturally irrigated.

Manuring was unknown. Had it ever been practised, it would have been mentioned among the preparatory stages of agriculture not less than irrigation. Nor do we know whether several species of grain were cultivated or whether the rotation of crops was understood. It was necessary, therefore, to let the soil lie fallow at certain periods. It was also not impossible to turn it into grass-land, since, the cultivation of meadows was at least not quite unknown.

Finally, I again refer here to the state of husbandry in the district of Zerafshān, as known to us and as described by Schuyler²:

‘Farmers possessing only four or five acres endeavour by careful cultivation to get as much out of their land as possible, without allowing it to lie fallow too long. In general the larger farmers pursue a modification of the three-field system. The field, after lying fallow for a year, is sown with winter-wheat or barley. The next year, after this crop is reaped, the land is again ploughed up and sown for the second harvest with millet, sesame, lentils, carrots or poppies.’

§ 20. *Manufactures.*

Every manufacture begins in the family. Originally, it is exclusively a domestic industry. Wherever it has already begun to become a profession, it is not the exclusive occupation. Farming is carried on at the same time as a subsidiary employment, as is not seldom the case in our villages.

Not before considerable numbers crowd together in one place, or before a lively commercial intercourse allowing the constant exchange of manufactured articles in return for natural productions, arises, will industry make any great progress. This progress, therefore, coincides with the gradual development of villages into towns. Then, by reason of the increasing demand, the manufacturer is able to support himself and his family by his industry. He finds it no longer profitable to work in the fields. All his energy is devoted to his craft; increasing custom sharpens his ingenuity, and thus industry thrives not merely in extent but also in excellence.

With the Avesta people it is true that manufactures did not develop in such a normal way. And yet the following sketch may serve as a standard whereby to judge the state of industry in Old Irān at the period described in the Avesta.

The articles of manufacture in use among the Avesta people were many and various, in fact, too varied to allow us to think of them as merely the

¹ Roscher, *Nationalökonomik*, § 25.

² *Turkištān*, vol. i, pp. 289-290.

productions of domestic industry in the full sense of the word. Thus we are compelled to assume that there was a distinct class of handicraftsmen.

With these brief observations I proceed to enter more closely into this question.

Special skill seems to have been shewn in the working of metals. The manufacture of instruments of gold and brass or bronze was the most important branch of this industry; but silver, copper and lead too seem to have been worked¹. We must not forget that the Avesta texts are too scanty to furnish an idea of the instruments which they made use of, or of their mode of working and technical knowledge.

Gold was the best known and most precious metal. No less on account of its brilliancy and splendour, than on account of the little difficulty which it offers to the workman, it was employed first of all metals in different parts of the world.

In Old-Irān jewellery was chiefly made of gold. The Avesta² speaks of golden fillets, ear-rings and necklaces. Gold cups or bowls seem to have been used on the occasions of the Hauma consecration³. Gold was also employed for the embellishment of arms, particularly the hilts of daggers and swords. The dagger, which the legendary king Yima wore as a badge of his sovereign power, is styled 'decorated with gold'⁴. Finally, it must be mentioned that gold embroidery on garments, coverings and carpets was not quite unknown⁵.

The chariot and the chariot-wheels of the *wind-yazata* Vayu and of Mithra are made of gold. The former wears a girdle, a helmet, and arms of gold; the latter is clad in a gold coat-of-mail⁶. The very hoofs of the horses of Mithra and Srausha are shod with gold or silver⁷.

It is hardly necessary to say that these words are merely metaphorical. Certainly no one will conclude from such descriptions that helmets or mail-coats, nay, even chariots and wheels and horse-shoes, were made of gold! Yet by these figures of speech it is proved beyond doubt that these precious metals were worked to no little extent. We see also that gold was considered a

¹ Vide pp. 147-148 of OKA. The workshop (?) of a worker in metals is called *pisra*. The particular class is denoted by the compounds: *zaranyō-saeṣpa*, *erezatō-saeṣpa*, &c. *Pisra* may be connected with Skr. *piç* 'to adorn, to decorate, to work skilfully'; *saeṣpa* must be derived from rt. *sip*, which has been preserved in N.P. *siftan* 'to harden.' For the whole statement compare Vd. VIII, 87 seq., where you will find a list of manufactures in which fire is used.

² *Zaranyō-pusa* 'with golden fillets' (Yt. XV, 57; XIX, 41); *zaranyō-miṇa* 'with a golden necklace' (Yt. XV, 57). Cf. Yt. V, 127 and p. 227 of OKA.

³ *Tashtra. zaranaena. Ys. X, 17.*

⁴ *Ashtra.zaranyō-paesa.* Vd. II, 7. Cf. Skr. *hiranya-peṣas*.

⁵ See pp. 223, 225, 227 of OKA.

⁶ Yt. XV, 57; X, 112, 124, 136.

⁷ Yt. X, 125; Ys. LVII, 27

symbol of affluence and splendour and therefore reckoned among the possessions of divine beings.

Besides vessels of gold there were others of silver, brass and copper, and likewise of stone, clay and wood¹. Those of brass or lead were of least value. The most common things only, used in every-day life, were made of these materials. It must be remarked that vessels of lead were apt to become very dangerous to health².

Silver was considered inferior only to gold. But the former was worked far less than the latter. The cup in which the Hauma is purified is made either of gold or silver. Mithra wears on his head a helmet of silver³.

Arms and weapons are chiefly made of brass or bronze, e.g., helmets and coats-of-mail, arrow-heads and metal-heads of clubs, as well as the blades of swords and daggers⁴. In the Avesta, therefore, the word 'brass' is metaphorically employed for arms.

Clubs were also covered with plates and knobs of *copper* to increase their size and weight⁵.

I come now to pottery.

Earthen vessels have already been mentioned above. They were usually baked in kilns⁶ specially constructed for the purpose. The art of making and burning tiles was also well known. But glass, as I think, was not yet made. The belief that the old Irānians manufactured glass would lead to important conclusions in the history of civilization. But it rests only on an incorrect interpretation of the text⁷.

I would, likewise, ascribe the use of coal as fuel to the age of the Avesta.⁸ The melting of metals required a fire of intense heat. This want may first have led to the use of coal. The material was less deficient in old times, we may suppose, than now-a days.

¹ Vd. VII, 74 seq. treats of the cleansing of such vessels. Cf. *hāvana, yaghaēna* (Ys. XXII, 2).

² *Ayāghaēnem, vā.srum, vā.nitēma, khshathra, vairya*. Vd, XVI, 6.

³ Ys. X, 17; Yt. X, 112.

⁴ An iron-foundry is called *fra-hich* (Yt. X, 96). Compare Skr. *saṁ-sich*, Athrawa veda, XI, 8, 13 (B.R. *sub voce*).

⁵ Hence *chakushanām-haosafrānānām*, Yt. X, 130.

⁶ *Tanūra*, N.P. *tanūr*, seems to denote the potter's kiln.

⁷ Vd. VIII, 84-85 says *khumbat.hacha.zemāni-pachikāt* and *khumbat.hacha.yāmū-pachikāt*. The first I translate 'from a potter's kiln, where clay is burned,' the latter 'from a potter's kiln, where vessels are burned.' The former term refers to the making of tiles, the latter to pottery in its proper sense. It cannot be thought strange that the making of the two articles was regarded as a single manufacture, and both are therefore called *khumba*. Of course *yāma* is connected with N.P. *jām* 'poculum.'

⁸ I infer this from Vd. VIII, 95, where I identify the word *skairya* with N.P. *sakūr*, *Sagūr* coal.' Thus also Geldner,

The art of *weaving*, though very old and known already in the Indo-Germanic period, is mentioned quite casually in the Avesta¹. With it is mentioned the art of working the skins of beasts into garments. Since Anāhita especially is represented as clad in skins, I conjecture that the robes of the nobility in particular were trimmed with fur. The passage referred to proves at the same time, that they knew well the seasons in which it was either profitable or the reverse to hunt beasts for their fur.

The building of carriages and the making of harness attained a high degree of perfection among the old Irānians and the old Indians. But it is to be regretted that many of the terms in question are obscure in the Avesta.

A distinction was made, I think, between war-chariots and baggage-wagons. The former bore a driver and a combatant; the latter served for the carriage of goods during peace.

As a rule there were two horses to each chariot. They stood on the right and left sides of the pole, and their halters were fastened to it by means of iron hooks². Sometimes a carriage-and-four was used³. Rich and noble gentlemen chiefly indulged in this luxury. The chariots of the *yazatas*, therefore, are especially described as drawn by four horses.

§ 21. *Medicine and Commerce.*

THE art of healing appears in the Avesta as a profession of a higher order. It plays no unimportant part in our texts. It had apparently already attained a certain degree of perfection; and, as I am inclined to believe, the priests all devoted themselves to this profession⁴.

Diseases were of course considered by the old Irānians to be the creations of Evil. They make their appearance in numberless forms. There are ten thousand, as the Bundehish asserts⁵. Angra Manyu created them on earth to damage the pious people. But Ahura Mazda set bounds no less to this plague than to all other works of the demons. He made the healing plants to grow, by the juice of which patients are healed⁶.

¹ *Vap* 'to weave.' Cf. *vastra-ubdaena* 'woven garments.' More difficult of interpretation is *izæna.vasytra*, which can scarcely be separated from **iza*, Skr. *aja*, *Ajā* 'goat.' It does not, therefore, signify garments of skins, but those made from the hair of goat. Cf. p. 224, note 5 of *OKA*.

² *Av. ratha* and *vāsha*. A horse completely harnessed is called *aspa-yukhta*.

³ *Akhna* and *aiwi-dāna* (=Skr. *abhidhānti*; cf. also Tomaschek, *Pāmirdialekte*, p. 73). Also in Yt. X, 125 some parts of the harness are enumerated, e.g., *hām-isa*, *Sima*; but I cannot make out their meaning.

⁴ *Vāsha.chathru-yukhta*, Vd. VII, 41.

⁵ *Baēshaza*, 'art to healing,' 'medicine,' and 'physician.' The last is also called *thamanāghvat*. Again medicine is *baēshazyā*. Cf. Skr. *bhishaj* and *bheshaja*. The expression *vimādhāgh* for 'curing' (Vd. VII, 38) deserves attention, because it is akin to Latin *medeor*, *medicus*, *medicina*. Compare, for the whole, Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. iii, pp. 581-582.

⁶ *Bdh.* IX, 4; West, 'Pahlavi Texts,' parti, p. 31.

⁷ Vd. XX, 3-4; XXII, 2.

Fevers chiefly are endemic in ancient as well as in modern Irān. They appear in different forms, and are, therefore, denoted in the Avesta by different names. Some of those names, for reasons which are apparent, originally mean 'flame' or 'heat' ¹.

The puerperal fever in particular is also mentioned in the Avesta as occurring to women in child-bed, and often endangering their lives. Like all other fevers, it is accompanied by a tormenting thirst ².

Women, moreover are exposed to divers diseases. Among them the Avesta mentions the disorder of the *menstruum*, consisting in an abnormal duration of hemorrhage ³.

Headaches also afflicted the Irānian ⁴. *Caries*, or consumption ⁵—the term in question is obscure—destroyed the strength of his body. An excess of sexual desire ⁶ might likewise become a sort of disease.

A grave national evil existed in divers cutaneous disorders, among which I shall only specify the itch. Most terrible was leprosy, which covers and destroys the body of the patient. It rages now-a-days too all over Central Asia and certain tracts of Persia ⁷.

The bite of snakes caused death by poisoning. This may be understood by 'the calamity caused by serpents,' spoken of in the Avesta. Some plants too, contained deadly venom, which might be fatal to the incautious ⁸.

Furthermore, there are enumerated in the Avesta a series, for the most part of bodily defects and infirmities, which were regarded as emblems of the evil spirit. There were people with a hump on their breasts or backs, stammerers,

¹ *Dazhu* (Vd. XX, 3), from rt. *daz*=Skr. *dah* 'to burn.' Next comp. *tafnu*=Phlv. *tapāshn* (N.P. *tubish* 'febris'); *sārusti* or *sārastya* (Phlv. *garm* 'heat, flame,; ' according to Darmesteter, Vd. p. 221, n. 1., it must mean the ague); *naṛza* and *naeṛzagh* (Phlv. *tanput*=N.P. *tanbad* 'rigor febris, feverish chill; ' yet in Yt. XIV, 33 it is used metaphorically for 'fire').

² *Yezicha.hē. hām. tafnō. jasāt. avi. lanuyē. zōishnuyē; yezicha. hē. dva. yaska. avi achishtō. ājasāt, yascha. sudhō. yascha. tarshnō*, Vd. VII, 70. The word *zōishnu* may be connected with the root *zan* 'to bear (children).'

³ Vd. XVI, 8 seq. I will no longer assert with confidence that *pishtra* and *skeāda* in Vd. V, 59, denote sexual diseases.

⁴ *Sārana*, from *sāra* 'head'

⁵ *Vazemō-asti*. Consumption, as a consequence of unnatural practices, is probably meant in Vd. XVIII, 54 by 'we dry away from him his tongue and his fat.'

⁶ *Vāvereshi* (Yt. XIII, 131) is certainly connected with Skr. *vrsh*, *vrshan*. In Vd. VII, 58, which may be regarded more or less as a parallel passage, we read *aghōshhtish pourushu. asti. varešō*, but the text is corrupt. I should like to change the first word into *aghaoshtish* (cf. *maidhyoshema*, perhaps for *maidhyaoshma* according to *Zddm G.* vol. xxxv, p. 666), 'evil desire,' from *agha ushti*.

⁷ *Gurenu*=N.P. *gar*, and *pāman*=Skr. *pāman* 'itch'; *paṛsō.vita-retō-tanush*=N.P. *pēs* 'leprosy.' Cf. Polak, *Persien*, vol. ii, p. 305; Schuyler, *Turkistān*, vol. i, pp. 147—148.

⁸ *Azhi-karshitem thaṛshō*.—*Kapasti*.—N.P. *kabast* 'poison.' I must pass over other names of diseases, as *azhana*, *azhahva*, *kurugha*, *duruka*, since they are not intelligible.

dwarfs or hunch-backed people and such as had overgrown teeth¹. To these must be added the blind and the deaf, the halt and the lame, the dumb and the idiotic. They are all marked by the devil [*disease*] and therefore excluded from the sacrifices of the pure *yazata* Anāhita².

'Healing by means of sayings (*māthra*)' was considered the chief and most efficacious kind of medical treatment³. But nobody could utter religious sayings and prayers more efficaciously than priests. The physicians, therefore belonged to the priestly order.

If prayers had not the wished-for effect and if the demons of disease would not depart from the patient, the physician was called in to help by his skill. According to the kind of disorder, therapeutics or surgery, 'the cure by means of plants' or 'the cure by means of apparatus' was employed⁴.

The best healing powers have been given by Ahura Mazda to plants especially the poisonous ones. In them deadly and healing qualities are combined⁵. To water also healing power was attributed both by the Irānians and the Indians⁶. Hence it is that Amertāt and Harvatāt, the genii of a long and healthy life, preside over water and plants.

The art of curing was thought very ancient. Its origin is traced back to the divine beings by tradition. This art was greatly valued by the Avesta people. The last three chapters of the Vendidad are almost exclusively devoted to it, and it is here that its origin is described.

*Thrīta*⁷, we are told, was the first 'of the helping, prudent, powerful, intelligent and rich men belonging to the family of the *Paradhāta*, who fought against sickness and death⁸. At his request Mazda causes the numberless multitude of healing plants to grow⁹. It is also he, according to tradition, who first contrived the double mode of treatment, either by plants having medicinal qualities or by surgical operations. With native simplicity he is

¹ Vd. II, 29; *frakava*, *apākava*, *āpāvaya*, *kasvi*, *vimitō-dañtan*. The translation of the different terms is based upon tradition.

² Ys. V, 93. *Aīda*=Skr. *andha* 'blind.' *Karena* comp. Tomasehek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 83 (Skr. *karṇa* 'ear'). *Drva* perhaps = *dhruva* 'fixed, not being able to move,' hence 'lame.' *Mūra*=Skr. *mūra* 'silly, idiotic.' *Ara* may perhaps be derived from the roots *rā*=Skr. *rā* 'to utter a sound,' with the primitive *a*, hence 'dumb.' Finally, *raṅha* comes from the root *raṅh*=Skr. *las* 'to hobble.'

³ *Māthrō-baēshaza* (Vd. VII, 44). The *māthra* and *ruhdo* are expressly called *baēshaza* or *baēshazyā* 'healing, curing.' Vd. IX, 27; X, 5; Yt. III, 5.

⁴ *Urvarō-baēshaza* and *karetō-baēshaza*. Vd. VII, 44.

⁵ Comp. *vish-ckithrem* 'a remedy coming from poisonous plants.'

⁶ Comp. Rv. I, 23. 19-21; Zimmer, *Ail.* p. 272.

⁷ Av. *Thrīta* corresponds to the Indian *Tritā*, to which, as is known, the Greek-*Τρίτων*, *Τριτωνίς*, *Τριτογένειζ* are correlative. Evidently *Tritā* was, originally, the deity of the water, either celestial or terrestrial. Since water was considered to possess sanative qualities, he might fitly be made the inventor and protector of medical science.

⁸ Vd. XX, 1-2.

⁹ *Urvarāo .baēshazydo*. Vd. XX, 4.

said to have requested from Ahura Mazda as a boon a medicine coming from poisonous plants, and a metallic knife¹.

Medical treatment did not extend to men only, but also to beasts². There are special precepts regarding the efforts which must be made in order to cure dogs that have run mad. Medicine should be administered to them entirely in the same way as to man. If this is done in vain it is permitted to use violence³.

He who intended to practise medicine was obliged to undergo a kind of preliminary examination, in connection with which the most characteristic feature was that surgical experiments were made on unbelievers. If they died under awkward hands, the loss was not considered a great one.

If he who underwent the examination failed in three operations, he was incapable for ever of becoming a physician. If, nevertheless, he practised medicine, and if one of his patients died in consequence of injudicious treatment it was imputed to him as intentional murder. But if, on the contrary, he succeeded in three operations and the patients recovered, he was allowed to practise without any restriction⁴.

If the physician was called to a sick person, he was obliged to answer the summons as soon as possible. But the Vendidad deprecates hastiness in the treatment of the sick. Great importance was evidently attached to a correct diagnosis. The physician must observe each symptom of the disease and learn its nature before he decides on this or that remedy. If a disease has begun in the morning, the treatment is to commence in the day-time ; if during the day, it shall be commenced in the night ; if in the night, the physician has to commence by day-break.⁵ This is a precept that was certainly dispensed with in cases of emergency.

The fee—which, it seems, was to be paid only after a successful cure—is laid down already in the Vendidad⁶. In speaking of the fee of a physician I enter upon the investigation of a very important matter in the civilization of the Avesta people, viz. the question of money.

The fee differs for men according to rank and calling, for beasts according to their utility. A priest is to be cured for a blessing. Therefore, he pays no taxes.

For curing the master of a house, the head of a village, the president of a community, and the sovereign of a country respectively, there should be paid

¹ *Vish-chithrem. dīm. ayasata. āyapta. khshathra. vairya*, Vd. XX, 3. The last term denotes firstly 'metal,' then 'a metallic tool,' 'a knife,' as in Vd. IX, 9.

² Vd. VII, 43.

³ Vd. XIII, 35 seq.

⁴ These regulations are found in Vd. VII, 36-40.

⁵ *Yēzi. uzirōhva. mereñchaitē, arczahva. baēshazyāt ; yēzi. arczahva. mereñchaitē, khshapōhva. baēshazyāt ; yēzi. khshapōhva. mereñchaitē, ushahva. baēshazyāt*, Vd. XXI, 3. "The sickness" is here the grammatical subject. *Mereñch* cannot mean, of course to kill but only 'to hurt, to prove hurtful.' Comp. Skr. *mṛch*.

⁶ Vd. VII, 41-43.

an ass, an ox, a horse or camel, and a carriage with four horses. For ladies, payment must be made, according to their rank, of the corresponding female beasts, a she-ass, a cow, a mare or a she-camel. The cure of a child of a family, particularly of a son, seems to have cost a horse. For curing a domestic animal the one next in value was always given; for a horse a cow, for an ox an ass, for an ass a sheep, while, last of all, bread and milk were given for a sheep,

We see that natural products, especially domestic animals, were the regular medium of payment. Thus the circumstances of the Avesta people were quite similar to those of the old northern nations and of the first epochs of Rome. In the one, cattle were regarded as the standard of value and money¹; in the other, all bargains were originally effected by bartering domestic animals, and coined money was not substituted before the legislation of the decemvirs.

Even in the making of contracts cattle or sheep were given in pledge, according to the precepts of the Avesta. He who violated or revoked such a contract had to give, according to the agreement, one or more head from his herd or flock.

The fee payable to a priest for performing the purificatory ceremonies was settled in domestic animals just like the fees of physicians. And here it is expressly laid down that the beasts themselves shall be given as far as practicable. Only in exceptional cases it was allowed to expiate a fault or transgression by giving other movable goods².

No proof can be adduced that we ought to understand by movable goods also coined money. On the contrary, this is contradicted by all other conditions of commerce. Wherever coined money is once known and in general use, it is impossible to think that payment in animals can be customary or desirable, even in the case of priests, to whom such property in animals could not but be inconvenient, considering that the nature of their duties constantly called them away from their own homes.

At most, it might be conceded that the nobility amassed, here and there in their houses, trinkets, jewels and other precious things which might perhaps serve as means of payment in some cases³.

¹ Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, p. 202.

² Vd. IX, 37-39: ' . . . If they can afford it, the Mazdayasna shall deliver to that man these animals from out of their herds or flocks. But if they cannot, they shall replace them by some other goods (*anyām. avartanām*). ' This translation of the passage, according to which the animals are evidently considered as being themselves *avareta*, proves that movable goods in general are only meant by it. The same is apparently signified by *shaēta* or *khshaēta* (=Phlv. *khvāstak*). If this is given as *weregild* 'compensation for a murder' (Vd. IV, 44), we cannot doubt that horses, cattle or sheep are meant more than anything else.

³ This might be inferred from Yt. XIII, 67; 'Just as a man, a valiant warrior, armed and watchful, drives (the enemies) away from his collected treasures (*hush-hām-beretat hacha,shaētāt*).'

Similar circumstances are found at least among cognate nations in a similar stage of civilization. So it is with the ancient Germans and the Indians of the Rig-veda. 'The chiefs of the Germans pay by means of horses and jewels; excellent horses and rings are given as gifts of honour; horses and jewels are very often granted as rewards in "Beowulf." The same is the case with the Vedic tribes: *Nishka*, a golden ornament for the neck or breast, serves as a present together with horses: "A hundred *Nishka* were given me (says the poet of *Kakshivant*) by the king who stood in need; with a hundred horses I was presented in one day.¹'

Of course we cannot speak properly of commercial intercourse, where a system of currency was entirely wanting. It was, I suppose, limited to the exchange of natural products between neighbouring communities.

But the desire to enter into commercial relations with other provinces cannot be said not to have existed in the time of the Avesta. The attempt was made to construct the first bridges and ways. The building of bridges in particular is highly meritorious, since streams and rivers are among the greatest obstacles to commerce². In the garden *Vara*, laid out by Yima (who during the great deluge finds here an asylum with his family), there are bridges and roads, as signs of good order and management.

In conclusion, I shall mention some of the standards of measure used in the Avesta.

A dry measure used for grain and even for liquids was the *Danare*³. I cannot say how much it contained.

The smaller linear measures are taken from parts of the human body and especially the *finger*. Sometimes, too, the uppermost joint of the middle finger is employed as a still smaller unit. Then follows the *span*, next the *ell* (the fore-arm from the top of the finger to the elbow), and, finally, the whole *arm*⁴.

The *foot* served for a further unit of measure; three feet make a *pace*⁵.

¹ Zimmer, *AIL*. p. 259.

² Comp. Vd. XIV, 16; XVIII, 74. 'Way' is *maregha*=Skr. *mārga*, (Vd. II, 26). 'Bridge' is *peshu* (=peretu, from the root *par* 'to pass over'), originally only a natural food. The bridge supported on piles or pillars is called more specifically *frashchinbana* (cf. *skemba*, Skr. *skambha*). Also *haetu*=Skr. *setu* means, I think both 'ford' and 'bridge.'

³ According to Vd. XVI, 7, a menstruating woman is to receive for (daily) food one *Danar tdyāra*(?) and two *Danar khshāudra*. De Harlez (*Av. tr.* vol. i, p. 235, note 5) observes regarding the *dānare*: 'Mesure de capacité ou de poids dont la base est une certaine quantité de grain. Elle paraît peser environ 700 grains.'

⁴ 'Finger'=*erezu* (the Skr. *dishthi* also is a linear measure, see B.R. *sub voce*). 'finger-point'=*tbishi*, Vd. XVII, 5, and 7; 'span'=*vīstasti*, N.P. *bīdast*; 'ell'=*vībdzu* 'rabāzu' (Skr. *prabāhu*) or *frāratni* (Skr. *aratni*); 'arm'=*bāzu*=Skr. *bāhu*.

⁵ 'Foot'=*padha*, as in *thripadha* and *navapadhu*; also *gāya* as in *aeuō-gāya* and *thri-gāya*. Vd. IX, 8, and 10.

A greater length was determined by the *Hāthra*. Three or four made a *Parasang* (*Farsang*)¹. A very interesting measure of length is the *Chartu*. Like the stadion of old Greece it seems to have been the length of the race-ground settled by use. But it might perhaps have been the distance made by a horse and his rider in one run². In this case the length of the *Chartu* would be entirely vague and unsettled.

§ 22. *The Settlements of the Avesta People.*

THE Avesta contains a whole series of expressions, having the general signification of 'colony' or 'settlement.' Sometimes they designate merely the relations in which the individual lives with his family and his domestics sometimes the hamlet or the village, sometimes even the entire district attached to it, sometimes the country, so far as it is in general cultivated and inhabited, in opposition to the surrounding unoccupied regions³.

1 Justi (in his *Hdb.*) says that the word *hāthra* denotes 'A measure of distance 1000 feet longer than a *parasang*.' But compare the different meaning of it given by West, *Pahlavi Texts*, part i, p. 46, note 5, and p. 98, note 2; *Bdh.* XIV, 4; XVI, 7, 29.

2 *Charetu* is, indeed, connected with the root *char* 'to run,' and *chareta* 'race-ground.' The 'Vara' of Yima is said to be a *chartu* long in every direction (Vd. II, 25). The tradition translates the word *asp-rūs* 'horse-way.'

3 The most important expressions may be traced partly from the root *khshi*, *shi* =Skr. *kshī*, partly from *had*=Skr. *sad* 'to sit down,' partly also from *karesh*=Skr. *krsh* 'to make furrows, to cultivate the field.' To *khshi* belong:—1. *Shiti* (such as *hu-shiti*=Skr. *sukshiti*, next *rāmō-shiti* 'quiet, secure settlement,' and *dareghō-shiti* 'lasting settlement'; *yāiryā hushiti* 'yearly, good dwelling' is to be particularly noticed, because in this expression an allusion is contained to a changing of the field.—2. *Shōitheman* in *hushoitheman* and *shayana*. The last one means the land generally inhabited, hence *airyō-shayana*. Gava is a *shayana*, i.e., the habitable part in Sughdha, Khnenta in Vehrkāna, Vaikerta in the land of the Duzhaka.—3. *Shōithra* is the 'field.' Hence this word stands together with conceptions such as *gaoyaoti* 'pasture-ground,' *maṭhana* 'dwelling,' *asagh* 'district.' Cf. also *shōithrya.apascha.zemascha.urvardoscha* p. 207, note 3. In Ys. 31, 16 *shoithrya* stands as elsewhere *zaitu*.

To the root *had* belong *hademan*, 'settlement,' and *hadish*, meaning the same. The latter word occurs thrice in the Vispered with the characteristic epithet 'rich in fields.' The former one belongs to the Gāthā dialect. To *karesh* belongs *karsha* in *karshō-rāza* 'founding, disposing and ruling settlements.' With this compare Ys. II, 2: 'The horse curses his rider: In future shalt thou not trap, mount, or rein a courser, as thou implorest not for strength for me in the numerous community, in the settlement abounding in heroes.' From the Old-Indian *krshī* and *charshani* may be taken for comparison, particularly *pañcha-krshayah* or *charshanyah* 'the five tribes.' With such names the Arians characterize themselves with pride as a nation pursuing agriculture. (Compare also Joh. Schmidt, *K.Z.* XXV, p. 89). In the Avesta *karshivat* still denotes the rustic or peasant.

Further expressions are: *maṭhana*, *maṭhanya*, and *maṭha* 'lodging, dwelling premises of a farm.' According to Yt. XIII. 57, *maṭhana* must concur with, *shōithra*. Worthy of notice are also such formations as *a-agh*, *shōithra*, *gaoyaoti*, *maṭhana*, Ys. I. 16. II. 16, III. 18, where *maṭhana*, I believe, denotes 'house and farm' as opposed to field (*shōithra*) and meadow (*gaoyaoti*). Herewith corresponds Ys. X. 7, *ahē. vīšē uta.maṭhanem* 'village and farm.' These words belong, according to Geldner (*Metrik* pp. 147 and 156, note 16), to the commentary.

This of itself proves what importance fixed settlements had in developing the civilization of the Avesta nation. It may be said with perfect justice that they generally formed the central point of their entire economical, religious and political life. The settled agriculturists and breeders of cattle are on the one side, and the homeless, restless, wandering herdsmen are on the other: these are the two great bodies, sharply opposed to each other, into which the inhabitants of ancient Irān were divided.

Though my present subject is, therefore, the system of settlement adopted by the Avesta people, still I must again discuss all its social features. In the section on 'Cattle-Breeding and Agriculture,' I have only dwelt upon the extent to which the economical life of the Avesta people had developed itself; in order to avoid repetitions I have not in the first place considered the course of that development. This historical part of the question must here necessarily appear in the foreground as far as possible. The chief point now is to trace the natural beginnings of the division mentioned above, and to show how the separation became wider and wider in course of time. It had become gradually more and more hostile and uncompensable, since one portion of the nation began to advance vigorously on the path of civilization, while the other remained stationary in its earlier stage of culture.

Fixed habitations are to the old Irānian the *beau-ideal* of good fortune, of rest, and of peace. They are a gift of the heavenly ones. Tishtrya is called 'the dispenser of the field.' He and Mithra bestow good and peaceful settlements and long-lasting habitations ¹.

In quite a similar manner the Vedic Indian in his hymns prays for 'good settlement' from the Gods. Indra, Agni, Soma, grant them to the pious

Also *gaṛ̥tha* denotes frequently 'settlement, premises of a farm.' Thus in the word *hadha-gaṛ̥tha* 'inmate.' It originally means 'possession, property' (*vide* p. 170, note 3), from root *gi=jī* 'to conquer, to obtain by victory, to acquire.' Comp. Skr. *jaya*, which has quite the same meaning. Then *gaṛ̥tha* often means 'people,' particularly, I think, in such expressions as *ashahe-gaṛ̥thāo* 'people of the pious,' Ys. XXXI. 1; Yt. V, 34; XIX, 41 and 93. The transition of meaning from 'settlement' to 'people living in settlements, settlers,' is found also in Skr. *kshiti* and Av. *hademan*. To the Av. *gaṛ̥tha* corresponds Old-Persian *gaithā*. The word stands near *mānya*, and denotes evidently the whole farm together with the farm-buildings as opposed to the dwelling house in particular. There is no doubt that *gaṛ̥tha* often means 'the herds.' I include here chiefly *drvō gaṛ̥tha* 'possessing healthy herds,' which stands near *haurva-fshu*, further Yt. VIII, 29, where *vāstra* and *gaṛ̥tha*, 'fields and herds,' are combined.

It would be very interesting if we could ascertain whether *khshathra* (certainly = N.P. *shahar* 'town'; should that word come from *shōithra*, it must sound *shēhar*) may mean 'fortified settlement.' It is striking that all the passages which may be adduced as proof, belong to the Gāthās. Comp. Ys. 45. 9 and 46. 16, but chiefly 34.3, where it is said that the farms lie in the fortified settlement (*vīspāo-gaṛ̥thāo.ā.khshathrōi*). If the translation be correct, we might ascertain in the case of Irān, the normal development of the town from the village surrounded with wall and trenches.

Finally, I mention *vīs* 'village,' and *umāna* 'single farm,' of which I shall speak further on.

¹ *Shōithrahē bakhtarc*, *hushayana*, *rāmō-shiti*, *dareghō-shiti* are in Yt. VIII. 2 and X. 4, appellatives of the two genii.

man¹. To him before all they belong, who stands under heavenly protection. Or they are possessed by the powerful ruler who protects his people with a strong hand and keeps away the enemy from his borders ².

Settlements can be naturally founded only in such places where there are rich pastures for cattle and sufficient arable land. Hence they are called 'the rich in fields.'

'When will, O Mazda! at the same time with piety, devoted sense
Fall to our lot, and together with power a good settlement rich in fields ?³'

The loyal attachment to it is closely connected with the high regard entertained for the settlement. The nomad moves from one pasture-ground to another; whenever he finds fodder for his herds, he halts; when there is none left he carelessly advances further.

The settlers on the other hand display their native feeling. They foster a noble love and reverence for the land already cultivated by their ancestors and inherited from them. It is an injustice and a shame to abandon them. This is doubtless implied in the words :

'May we be such as preserve their settlements,
Not such as forsake them⁴.'

Let us transfer ourselves to that period of time in which the Arian or Indo-Irānian tribes advanced gradually from their original home towards the south.

It is well known that even thus early agriculture was no longer foreign to the Indo-Germans. The breeding of cattle was, however, paramount. When, in their wanderings and migrations, the Arians took possession of the districts on the northern slope of Paropamisus, they naturally led a life at least half-nomadic. Though they were not continually in motion, still we may assume a constant change of pasture-lands in winter and summer.

The breeding of cattle amongst the nomads, however, is everywhere on a large scale, while the mode of agriculture which they pursue is characteristic as wasting to the soil. Wherever they repose with their herds a suitable piece of land is brought under the plough to produce the necessary supply of corn. The pasturage having been consumed and the single harvest got in, and the colder season returning, the exhausted soil is abandoned and another district is visited.

¹ *Sukshiti* (*hushiti*). Rv. II. 10·8; X. 20. 10; V. 6. 8; VI. 2. 11; I. 91. 21; IX, 108·13.

² Rv. I. 40·8; VII. 74·6.

³ Ys. XLVIII. 11 *hushitish.vastravaiti*. Cf. Vsp. IX, 5, the epithets *ashavat. vāstracat. marezhdikavat.hvāthravat* with *hadhish*. As here, again, *asha* stands near *vāstra*, it may be taken for 'corn, bread,' as in Vd. III. 3 (vide *OIK.* p. 235, note 2 and p. 408, note 1) *Hvāthra* is naturally to be separated into *hu-āthra*, and opposed to *duzhāthra*.

⁴ Yt. X, 75; *buyama.ṛṣ.shōithrō-pānō* mā.buyama.shōithrōirichō*. The glossographers add here the current ideas *mā-nmānō-irichō* and *vīśō-irichō*, &c., which appear to be a gloss even because *shōithra* stands first, what is certainly not conformable to the system.

The nomadic way of living presupposes in consequence a very extensive territory with a thin population. With the increase in the number of inhabitants, people are obliged to remain content with a more confined space. The change of pasture-lands according to the seasons is discontinued. In colder districts on mountains a kind of husbandry peculiar to them takes its place; cattle are fed in stables during winter, and driven over the mountain-pastures during summer.

The abode becomes a permanent one, and houses of a more solid kind are naturally constructed. They are built to last longer and are more adapted to the requirements of the climate. The soil occupied is worked with the utmost regard to its capabilities; a ruthless and exhausting mode of cultivation would merely harm him who pursued it. More attention is paid to agriculture because relatively it pays better than the breeding of cattle. At the same time agriculture becomes more imperative, since a change of the fields no longer takes place, and the management of the farm becomes also more rational and systematic. Slowly, and gradually, and not by violent fits and starts, takes place the development by which the nomadic tribes are changed into a settled nation devoted to agriculture.

To this transitional stage the Arians had evidently arrived even before their separation. But arable soil is not to be found in abundance even in the Hindukush districts. I might therefore believe that it was actually the want of such a soil which induced the Indian tribes to emigrate through the Suleiman passes.

Of the Irānian tribes, several persisted in their nomadic way of living. But those whom we designate as the Avesta people are, in the earliest epoch when we hear of them, already in that stage of transition.

Here we have in my opinion reached a point where a very important difference prevails between the Gāthā period and that of the later Avesta.

In the Gāthās the 'cow' is the peculiar centre of the economical life. Agriculture is by no means unknown, but it is far from occupying the same place as the breeding of horned cattle. The perfection of the latter indeed is probably also a characteristic mark of the transition from nomadic life to fixed settlements. The more easily moveable, small cattle, such as sheep and goats, form the principal property of wandering herdsmen.

Ahura Mazda is in the Gāthās emphatically called the 'Fashioner of the Cow.' It is He who created her for the benefit of mankind. The divine spirits themselves take care that she may find sufficient pasture. Several epithets of honour are conceded to her¹. Nay more, an entire hymn treats exclusively of

¹ *Gēush.tashā*, epithet of Ahura, Ys. XXIX, 2; XXXI, 9; *yē.ahmāi.gām. rānyō-skeretim.hēm.tashat* 'who created for us the delight-bestowing cow,' Ys. XLVII 2. Besides *rānyō-skereti*, chiefly *hūdāō* 'bestowing good things' occurs as an epithet of the cow, which epithet is also usual in the later Avesta.

the wrongs and oppressions which she endures at the hands of her enemies the nomads. The heavenly powers themselves consult how that evil may be checked, and promise to send Zarathushtra as a saviour and helper upon the earth¹.

It is erroneous to assume that the growth of agriculture led the nation to settle down in permanent dwellings. The development of agriculture on the contrary is frequently the result of a more fixed establishment, both of which however, are in turn perfected by a more studied and rational cultivation of cattle breeding, especially the breeding of neat-cattle.

This the poets of the Gāthās knew very well :

‘She, the cow, gave us good settlements and prosperity
And estates, she that was longed for by the good ;
For her caused the plants to germinate according to the holy order
Ahura Mazda from the beginning of the first world².’

And how at this time agriculture and the breeding of neat-cattle mutually influenced each other, is expressed in the following stanza :

‘But she, the cow, selected of those two the active countryman for herself.

As her pious lord, the guardian of the good mind.

But he who did not follow agriculture did not participate in the good religion, though he attempted to deceive³.’

So also the Gāthās. But on the other hand quite a different picture is presented in the younger Avesta. But here also the possession of herds is highly esteemed. Mithra is called ‘the bestower of herds⁴.’ The yazatas are entreated for bullocks and horses, and their possession is looked upon as a gift of grace from the heavenly powers⁵. But the ‘cow’ does not in the least figure so prominently as in the epoch described by the Gāthās.

The economical development has continually and regularly advanced. Agriculture has undergone important technical improvement. At this time it is no longer of secondary consideration, but stands on the same level with cattle breeding ; in fact it even appears to surpass the latter in value and importance⁶. That transition which began in the Arian period and continued in

¹ Ys. XXIX.

² Ys. XLVIII, 6. *Hā* at the beginning of the stanza refers doubtlessly to *gavōi* of the precedent stanza ; *vāghēush managhō berchallhē* refers to *hā*, and is probably nom. sing.

³ Ys. XXXI, 10. In line 2, on account of the metro, it is required to read *fshēngīm* (Speigel, Comm. II, 243), which has no difficulties at all, because of the following *m*, and admits also of an orderly construction. Cf. Roth, *Yaçni*, XXXI, pp. 8-9, 24-25. One feels induced to translate *vāghēush managhō* here and in other passages in the Gāthās directly by ‘cattle.’

⁴ *Vāthvō-dāo*. Yt. X, 65.

⁵ Yt. X, 28. Cf. above, p. 176.

⁶ This is clearly to be seen from Vd. III. 4-5, where agriculture and cattle-breeding are mentioned together, and even agriculture before cattle-breeding.

the Gāthās, is now complete. The Avesta people have become a firmly settled nation of agriculturists.

I must here again lay stress on the fact that in the Gāthās the opposition is really not between herdsmen and husbandmen, but frequently between the nomads and the settled population. To the latter did the proclaimer of the new religion address himself. Amongst them did the new religion first find acceptance.

‘ For that I ask Thee, give me the right answer, O Ahura :

How shall I maintain pure the doctrine

Which shall be proclaimed before the liberal prince

As the true supreme power and as the best doctrine by thy follower,

O Mazda,

Who lives *amongst the settlers* with piety and good mind ¹?

‘ Oh Zarathushtra, who is thy pious friend,

In thy great work ? Who is it that wishes to announce it ?

It is he himself, Kavi Vishtāspa, the one armed for battle,

And those whom besides, O Mazda, Thou selectest *from the settlers*,

Those will I praise with the prayers (*māthras*) of the pious mind ².’

With the spread of the new doctrine therefore the increase of settlements goes hand in hand. When a hitherto nomadic tribe becomes converted to the Zoroastrian religion, it abandons its former unsettled mode of living, builds permanent dwellings, and cultivates the fields :

For that do I ask Thee, give me the correct answer, O Ahura !

That is, for the doctrine which is the best of all that exist,

Which, when it is followed, multiplies for me piously the settlements.

Together with the words and works of devotion may He grant it to me rightly !

My soul’s wishes crave for Thee, O Mazda ³.’

‘ For this end do I approach Thee, Blissful Spirit,

Ahura Mada, Thou Commander through the good mind ;

Through whose deeds the settlements are piously increased ;

To them does their devoted sense teach the precepts

Of Thy Spirit, whom nobody can deceive ⁴ !’

The divine beings support man in his work of civilization. Hence they bear the name ‘increasing and furthering the settlements ⁵.’ Ahura Mazda

¹ Ys. XLIV, 9.

² Ys. XLVI, 14. *Harēma* is, of course, not to be separated into *ha+dēma* but stands or *hadema*=Skr. *sadman*.

³ Ys. XLIV, 10 : *yā.mōi.gaēthāo.ashū.frādhōit.kachēmna*.

⁴ Ys. XLIII, 16 : *yēhyū.shkyaathanāish.ga:thāo.ashū.frādheñte*. The same formula see Ys. XIX, 17. Cf. Vsp. II, 5 ; III, 4, &c.

⁵ *Frādhāt-ga:tha, varedhāt-ga:tha*.

takes care of the farm-houses¹ and Srausha is called 'the protector of the settlements of the pious².'

The conversion of a Tūrānian tribe to Zoroastrianism is already noticed in the Gāthās. Through it the settled dwellings of those who are of 'devoted sense' are increased³. The Fryānas thus relinquished their nomadic life and joined the number of the settlers.

The adversaries of the Mazda religion are nomads. How these maintained their position near the settled population of Irān is explained by the condition of the soil.

Even at the present day in Afghānistān permanently settled tribes that pursue agriculture dwell near and amongst nomadic people. The Ghilzai, to whom the territory on the Tarnak river belongs, are partly wandering herdsmen and partly peasants⁴.

The Sturiānī were originally nomads. Only a little before Elphinstone's sojourn in Afghānistān had they adopted agriculture and fixed settlements. A strife with a neighbouring tribe had narrowed their territory, and this necessitated a more careful cultivation of the soil.

The Shirānī pursue agriculture; their neighbours the Vazirī wander round about with their herds. So too the Nassers. These pass every autumn in constant warfare through the dominion of their bitterest enemies, the Vazirī, in order to search for pasture-grounds in warmer districts during winter. In spring they return by the same way and amid the same perils to the cooler mountain-heights⁵.

That nomadic tribes also embraced Zoroastrianism is not quite impossible, but it is also by no means certain.

We know for a fact that the Mazdayasnān dwelt sometimes in tents which were subjected like other dwellings to purification enjoined by the Law. In the hut of an unbeliever the ceremonies of the Avesta would of course not be practised.

However, such could scarcely have been the case in more than a temporary way. Herdsmen who watched the cattle on their pasture-grounds may have lodged themselves in tents. It is also to be borne in mind that every dweller in a tent is not therefore a nomad. Many inhabitants of Afghānistān who pursue husbandry prefer the tent to a fixed habitation. This predilection appears to be a remnant of an earlier period, of a time in which the tent was indeed the sole homestead of the family.

¹ Ys. LV, 4.

² *Hishārō-ashahē.gāthāo*. Ys. LVII, 17.

³ Ys. XLVI, 12; cf. p. 31.

⁴ Masson, *Narrative*, II, 205; Elphinstone, *Kabul*, II, 172-175; Spiegel *E.A.* I, 321 seqq.

⁵ Elphinstone, *Kabul*, II, 90-91, 97, 212 seqq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* I, 309-310, 324.

What then was the usual form of settlement amongst the Avesta people ?

As a rule the Mazdayasnān dwelt in *villages*. The village was composed of a certain number of dwellings, each of which harboured a family ¹.

Thus it is said in a certain prayer : ' Into my house may there come the contentment, blessing, guilelessness and appreciation of the pious men. May there now arise for our village, piety and power, blessing and magnificence and happiness, and long-lasting dominion of the faith, which originates from Ahura and from Zarathushtra. Soon may there issue from our village cattle and corn (?) and the strength and adherence to Ahura, of the faithful men ² ! '

Into these villages the wolves secretly steal to seize their prey. The villagers stand under the special protection of the *manes*. The spirits of the departed ones also return to them annually at the season of *Hamaspalamai-dhaya* ³.

By the last name are frequently designated the villages of the Mazdayasnān. They are visited by the hordes of hostile plundering tribes, who suddenly rush upon them to murder men, to drive away their cattle and to carry away into cruel imprisonment their wives and children ⁴. They therefore pray to the good spirits that the villages may be lasting, good and peaceful settlements, chiefly that there may not befall them any scarcity of water and failure of crops, which might compel the inhabitant to quit his beloved home-stead and to search for new dwellings ⁵.

Along with the village-system, there, however, also existed the *farm-like settlement*.

The reasons for different forms of habitations spring entirely from the natural conditions of the land, to which man adapts himself at all times and places with an instinct peculiar to himself for choosing that which is necessary and wholesome.

Extensive plains, be they high or low-lying grounds and desert plateaus do not favour the foundation of fixed settlements. They are essentially the territory adapted to wandering tribes. Thus the nomadic mode of life and extensive cattle-breeding must have always prevailed on the rather sterile elevated plains in the south of Afghānistān and on the steppes of the Caspian and Aral Seas.

Mountains, which of themselves render the free movement of larger masses of men and animals difficult, are usually the first cause of permanent

¹ Vis 'village' : *nmāna* 'a single habitation, farm.'

² Ys. LX, 2-3. 'Corn' = *ashem*.

³ Vd. XIII, 11 and 40 ; Yt. XIII, 49.

⁴ Vd. XVIII, 12 ; cf. p. 28 ; cf. *kutha.nasush.apayasūnē hacha.avanhat.vīsat.yat. māzdayasnōit*, Vd. XIX, 12.

⁵ Ys. LXVIII, 14 : *hushkiti rāmō-shkiti* besides *dareghō-shkiti*. Ys. XII, 2-3 : *us. māzdayasnīnām.vīsam.zyānayaechā.vīvāpacha* (mod. Pers. *bīgāb*) . . . *nōit.alnāt.āzyūonām nōit.vīvāpēm kshī māzdayasnīsh avi vīšō*.

dwellings. Even wild rugged mountain-districts appear at a very early period to have been inhabited by settled populations to as great a height as the climate would allow men to dwell in the higher part, however, being still available for pasture¹.

The expansion of the settlement is of course entirely dependent upon the condition of the soil. Larger settlements can spring up only where continuous piece of fertile land are found. If the cultivable soil consists on the contrary of broken and isolated pieces of smaller extent, interrupted by steppes or barriers or rock incapable of cultivation, the tendency to separate and establish independent farms and hamlets will predominate².

Finally, another consideration has likewise a mighty influence upon the security of life and property.

In an open country which is exposed to hostile inroads, people are always obliged to unite in one large community in order to enable themselves to make a successful resistance against their enemies. This is particularly the case where a nation of agriculturists have as near neighbours nomadic tribes who are indeed their natural and most dangerous enemies.³

In mountainous countries, where nature itself offers the means of protection, the settler enjoys greater freedom. Here he can separate himself from his relatives and companions and look for pasture and arable land according to his own taste. He can live as a free lord upon his farm independent of neighbours, unhampered by the restrictions necessary in a large community.

These universal laws affect the most diverse nations of all ages and countries and may be likewise applied to the condition of settlement of the Avesta people.

Under what circumstances larger communities are found is clearly seen when we fix our eyes upon the present boroughs of Eastern Irān. These are generally situated on the banks of rivers, where they pass from the projecting mountains into the plains or from fertile *oases* into the flat land. Here are combined the two requisites which chiefly render possible the rise of larger settlements.

On the one hand, the best arable land is really found at the foot of the mountains near the rivers and of sufficient extent to maintain a very large number of people. On the other hand, the edge of the plains is naturally most exposed to the pillaging inroads of the nomads. In fact, the large river valleys serve as roads through which to penetrate deeper into the mountains.

¹ Andrian 'Ueber den Einfluss der verticalen Gliederung der Erdoberfläche auf menschliche Ansiedlungen,' in the transactions of the Anthropological Society of Vienna vol. vi, 1876, pp. 2-6.

² Inama-Sternegg, *Untersuchungen über das Hofsystem im Mittelalter*, p. 7 seqq.; Roscher, *Nationalökonomik*, § 75.

³ Andrian, l. c. p. 12.

Andkhūi, Shibarghān, and more particularly Merv are towns which owe their existence to *oases*. The tracts between the flat land and the mountains are held by Kunduz, Khulum, Balkh and Sarakhsh. Siripūl, Maimane and Herāt lie in a broad and easily accessible river-valleys, and indeed just in the parts where the valleys begin to narrow.

In the south, Farā, Girishk, Kandahar exhibit quite the same natural features. The last-mentioned town especially is founded with an exceedingly skilful adaptation to the nature of the ground. It lies on a plateau which is formed by the last projections of the mountain-range. On the west and the east it is sheltered by the Arghandāb and Tarnak, which unite below the town. The plain is thus on all sides naturally protected by these rivers, while the mountains rise in its rear.

Gazni and Kabul were probably built partly for strategical reasons and partly on account of the richness of the surrounding country in arable and pasture land.

In all these places native legends maintain the high antiquity of the town.

Balkh is regarded as a populus and fortified town even in the legends of Ninos and Semiramis, and is called the 'mother of towns' by the natives¹.

The foundation of Merv is ascribed to Tahmūrāth, the *Takhma-Urupish* of the Avesta². Kandahār is said to have been built under Lohrāsp, called Arvat-aspa in the Avesta³. On both sides of Girishk, ruins of great antiquity are found on either bank of the Hilمند. These are the remnants of an important town, which, according to the belief of the native inhabitants, flourished in the time of Alexander⁴. To the pre-Macedonian period must also belong the golden age of the ancient Farā; however, we do not know how far back in ancient times we are entitled to place it⁵.

In conclusion, I have yet to mention the numerous and extensive ruins scattered over the plains of Seīstan. They contain the remains of towns, castles and other buildings, whose erection is ascribed by native tradition to the sovereigns of the legendary dynasty of the Kayānians. The want of security against the pillaging Baluchees even now forces the inhabitants on the delta of the Hilمند to unite themselves into larger settlements.

On the rugged and rocky heights of the Hindukush and in the Alpine regions on the upper Oxus regular towns could not be erected. Here the natural circumstances are favourable to the establishment of smaller villages and hamlets, and even of single farms. Arable land is here found only in small fragments, which do not allow a large number of people to live together. The variegated character of the soil furthered the segregation of the inhabitants.

¹ Burnes, *Bokhara*, II, 204; Ferrier, *Voyages*, I, 389 seqq.; Vámbéry, *Reise in Mittelasien*, 206.

² Burnes, *Bokhara*, III, 30 seqq.

⁴ Ibid. II, 120.

³ Ferrier, *Voyages*, II, 132, note 1.

⁵ Ibid. II, 278-279.

The natural security of the country permitted the separation into small groups or into single families.

The existence of the farm-settlement along with the village-settlement can be proved also from the Avesta.

The Vendidad, referring to the provisional places for the disposal of the dead body called *Kata*, contains the definite command that such *Katas* should be built *in each village* and *in each house*¹. Certainly it cannot be meant thereby that the whole community, and moreover each individual family, should have *Katas* of their own. That would be palpably absurd. The commandment is only intelligible if we take into consideration the co-existing forms of settlement.

Where people dwell there must be *Katas*, even in each separate farm-house, where it may prove necessary in the event of death taking place. For a village the building of one set of *Katas* is, however, sufficient. There they are evidently the property of the community, ready for use whenever a death occurs in a family residing in the village.

The Avesta people were not without enemies. Their exposed settlements were subject to sudden inroads of the nomads of the steppes, without taking into consideration that in threatened districts, where a larger number of people united themselves, measures had to be taken to ward off such dangers.

On convenient sites were built castles, which in time of war gave shelter to the women, children and herds, or else the village was surrounded with a wall and entrenchments. The way in which people secure themselves to this day in Khorāsān against the attacks of the Turkomans is similarly characteristic. Everywhere, even in the immediate neighbourhood of the villages towers are built on the fields. When the dreaded horsemen appear, the people who are on the open fields escape into the nearest tower, and maintain themselves there until either help arrives or the Turkomans withdraw.

As in the Avesta we have no direct evidence of any of the modes of defence mentioned above, we must confine ourselves to general observations².

¹ Vd. V, 10; cf. p. 172. Also in Vd. VIII, 103 I recognize an allusion to the system of villages and farms; in that passage the last two words of *nazdishtem. avi. nmānemcha. vīsemcha. zaitumcha. dahyūmcha* are to be erased as glossarial additions; for it is nonsense to say that a man who has become impure, should run to the next district, or even to the next province and ask, with a loud voice, for the performance of the purificatory rite; whereas it is proper that this should be done at the first village or farm where he arrives. The wish to place together those four current expressions caused the awkward interpolation. Analogous passages are Ys. IX, 28 and Yt. X, 75; but I believe that, on a particular examination, still more passages would be found.

² Very difficult is the passage Yt. V, 130, and therefore little fit for proving the fact; one might possibly thus translate it: 'I will set up a fence (*vāremān*) in the plains (*upa staremaēshu*.) which protects all that belongs to livelihood (*huṣṣyātīm*), and makes to increase the power when it is necessary to withdraw' (*zazūit*, dat. sg. of the pres. part. of *rt. z* ?).

Fortified places that stand vacant in time of peace and are occupied on the outbreak of a war, only fulfil their object to a certain extent. They are suitable where a regular war occurs, the outbreak of which may be calculated on with some certainty. Near the edge of a desert where war is more or less incessant, and where people have to be on their guard against sudden attacks every day and every hour, such fortified places serve no purpose. How could it have been possible on the alarm of very sudden and wholly unforeseen invasion actually to convey women and children into the castles, and to collect the herds and drive them behind protecting walls ?

Against such dangers there is indeed no absolute security. In addition to the union of a large number of warlike men, which inspired the barbarians with respect, the practice of always maintaining permanent dwellings in a fit state for defensive warfare offered the best protection. Whoever was surprised in the open country by robbers was infallibly lost. Only the lives and property of those who were sheltered behind walls were safe.

It is my opinion, therefore, that even in the most remote period *fortified* places were founded where the present Eastern Irânian towns are situated. The development of the town from the fortified village is quite normal. I might even consider it as by no means improbable that the beginnings of the town-like settlements go back even to the age of the Avesta.

The point to be most considered here is, what we should understand by a 'town.' Towns where houses are ranged one close to the other in regular streets, where the profession of the tradesman is held in the same honour as that of the agriculturists, yea, even surpasses the latter, and where commerce and mercantile pursuits flourish ; such were unknown to the Avesta people.

In the case of the Avesta people the characteristics of the village and of the town are so fundamentally different, that a particular name for the latter could not but be wanting in the Avesta language. Trade, besides, does not play in the Avesta nearly such an important part as cattle-breeding and agriculture. The entire life, as it is pictured to us, is the life of herdsmen and peasants. Commerce seems to have been completely unknown, and the conditions of intercourse, the exchange of products, purchase and sale, were evidently quite primitive.

If, on the other hand, we define the town as an enclosed and fortified settlement, constantly inhabited in all its parts, of larger extent and with more numerous inhabitants, the existence of town-like settlements amongst the Avesta people is at least probable. In that case the fortified village and the town properly so-called differ only with respect to their dimensions.

The large village ranks just below the town. Through the accession of fresh communities and the constant growth of population, circumstances are generally brought about, under which a real town life first develops itself.

The preliminary conditions for the formation of town-like settlements were offered, if anywhere, in Eastern Iran. The economical possibility of maintaining a larger number of people is limited to certain countries. But just where it exists, insecurity of life and property combines to make the union into extensive communities necessary.

Here I refer also to the condition of settlements amongst the kindred tribes.

The practice of dwelling in open villages and boroughs was by no means so exclusively an Indo-Germanic custom as it is generally supposed to be. In every place where historical circumstances or the special aspect of the soil are conducive to it, people even at very early periods are led to the foundation of enclosed and fortified towns¹.

The Italici had already passed the stage of village life, while they still dwelt in the valley of the Po. Their settlements discovered there are without exception surrounded by trenches and walls of earth. They exhibit a systematical design in the form of a rectangle, and cover an area of three or four, nay, even of ten hectares².

The Germans, too, who still manifest in general a distinct inclination towards independence and separation into their settlements, abandoned the farm or village settlement even where the external condition made it desirable. The large settlements of the Quades on the March and the Danube are, therefore, characteristic. For instance, the village in the province of Braunsberg, which is surrounded with a large circular wall, covers an area of thirteen hectares, the space occupied by dwellings, the place of arms in Stillfried on the March, even extend over twenty-five hectares.

Such places, however, did not merely serve for refuge during war. On the contrary, discoveries made in them prove that they were also fully and constantly inhabited in times of peace.³

The Gorodists of Southern Russia may also not have been mere castles to be used in case of war. The discoveries made within the circuit of the walls compel us rather to assume that those were constantly inhabited⁴. As regards their dimension, it is true, they are considerably inferior to the enclosed villages of the plains of the Po, or to the settlements of the Jurades.

Finally, I come to the nation which is most closely akin to the Irânians—to the Vedic Indians. Here we have a very clear instance of how the

¹ With the following cf. Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge Roms* p. 29. seq.,

² Helbig, *Beitrag zur altitalischen Kultur- und Kunstgeschichte*, I, *Die Italiker in der Poebene*.

³ Much, *Transactions of the Anthropological Society of Vienna*, V, 39 seq.; cf. Inama-Sternegg, *Deutsche Wirthschaftsgeschichte*, I, 6-7.

⁴ *Revue des deux mondes* of 1874, p. 795; Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge Roms*, pp. 35-36; but see Zimmer, *AIL.* pp. 146-147.

geographical and historical conditions severally affect the form of settlement. I place myself without any hesitation on the side of Zimmer, who denies the existence of urban settlements among the Arians of the Rig-veda.

Nowhere do we meet with any certainty with the name of a town in the hymns of the Rig-veda. The people dwelt rather in villages, hamlets (*grāma*), which were mostly completely open The *pur* served as a defence against the attacks of enemies as well as against inundations ; they were, as far as we can perceive, situated on elevated points, and were protected by mounds and entrenchments, within which people took refuge with their wives and chattels in the time of danger. They may have been particularly abundant on the shores of rivers, for there the most obstinate battles were fought, according to the testimony of the Vedic hymns¹.

Now nothing would be more improper than to transfer such conditions from the old Indians to the Irānians. Even sub-divisions of the same people often display according to circumstances a great difference in their settlements. The Slavi lived, partly in entirely unfortified abodes, partly in regular and enclosed settlements². The testimony of Tacitus regarding the division of the Germans into single farms and unfortified hamlets is by no means applicable to all tribes and districts. Italian peasants in the Apennines lived, even in the Imperial age, in small boroughs, whilst the Italic of the prehistoric period had already become builders of towns.

Thus the Vedic Indians and the Irānians of the Avesta, owing to the great difference in the nature of the countries in which they lived and of the historical circumstances which influenced them, may have and must have gone different ways.

We know how the nature of their soil must of itself have led the Irānians to the building of larger and enclosed settlements. To a great extent this was not the case with the Indians. The Indus valley and the Panjab display, by far, greater uniformity in the aspect of the soil. It is a flat and open land which, of itself, conduces more to the splitting up and scattering of the people.

The chief point of difference is, however, quite another one. An urban settlement certainly presupposes a longer establishment in the land. This is applicable to the Avesta nation, who, so far as our information goes, dwelt in the districts north and south of Paropamisus.

With the Indians the case was entirely otherwise. The Rig-veda does not at all represent them to us permanently settled. The Arian people of that age are, on the contrary, continually moving. They are advancing slowly, from west to east, drawing near to the banks of the Ganges. One river line after

¹ Zimmer, *AIL*. pp. 147-148.

² Thus, according to Prokop's descriptions, the advancing and therefore nearly nomadizing Slavi on the Danube. Vide Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge Roms*, p. 35.

another of the Panjab becomes occupied ; the aborigines are more and more forced backward or driven into the mountains.

Under such circumstances a town-like settlement could evidently not develop itself. For the security of property the building of castles was sufficient. A circumvallation of the village was required only in isolated localities.

The troops marching at the head of the migrating Arian nations were engaged in constant and bloody wars with the Dâsa, and lived probably in a sort of military camp. The tribes living further back enjoyed a relative security, which was only disturbed by actual feuds between the Arians themselves.

Of such sudden invasions as the Irânians had to expect, the Rig-veda says nothing, to my knowledge. They were certainly not so common and not the usual form in which war was waged. The preparations which people made against the impending dangers from enemies, must consequently have been entirely different in India from what they were in Irân.

Indeed, the settlements of the Arians of the Avesta and of the Rig-veda developed under totally different conditions. Accordingly the result must have been entirely different with the respective nations in spite of their close relationship, and notwithstanding all other uniformity of custom and culture.

In conclusion, I come to the question whether the founders and inhabitants of a village were bound together by relationship, or whether they had united themselves in settlements for any other causes, that is, whether the Eastern Irânian village was the village of kindred races or not.

The following explanation respecting the development of a village would appear to be the most probable one. Every individual man selected at pleasure his piece of ground, on which he settled himself with his family. The sons, when they were grown up and established their own homesteads, built their dwellings near that of their father. Around their farms followed afterwards those of grandsons and great-grandsons. The field was cultivated as a common property and its revenue divided ¹.

Moreover, I consider this primitive development of the village of a family out of the single farmhouse as in many cases possible. That farm-like settlements were known amongst the Avesta people is not to be doubted. That the descendants of a head of a family settled in the immediate neighbourhood of the family mansion, rather than remove themselves to a distance from it, altogether corresponds with the old Irânian spirit.

¹ In that manner the Bohemian village is said, by Palacky, to be originated. According to him (Palacky), the Bohemian built his house in the midst of his landed property. His descendants managed the paternal estate, often during several generations, in common, and without dividing it ; if the paternal house was not more capable of holding their increased number, other houses were built in the proximity, and this was the origin of the most ancient Bohemian villages that were as many in number as small in extent, since all their inhabitants originally formed but one only family. Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge Roms*, p. 51.

Amongst the Parsees in Bombay a most highly remarkable custom exists even at the present day, in which the inclination towards the closest possible union of the respective families is strikingly manifest. Here the sons are not wont, even when they are grown up and married, to set up really independent, households. So long as there is any room, they dwell, together with the other relatives of their father's family, in the house of their parents. Even if a man has six or seven sons, they all live, with their wives and children, with the head of their family¹. We may also add that when any scarcity of room occurs and a new dwelling has to be occupied, the latter is looked for in the closest possible vicinity of the father's house."

The Tajiks also in Badakhshān live together in kindred families, and we may imagine that such is the case with the rest of the Galchas, of whose manner of life and customs we do not, unfortunately, possess any account.

In the whole Badakhshān the villages, called *Kishlak*, exhibit the same design². They are divided into several quarters or hamlets, each of which

¹ Dosabbhy Framjee, *The Parsees*, p. 87.

² I give here a very interesting passage of Wood's *Journey to the Source of the River Oxus*; it is a very clear description of a Tajik village in Jerm; the description may also be regarded as a kind of addition to p.52 :

"It is customary in these countries for relations to live in the same hamlet, often to the number of six or eight families. An outer wall surrounds this little knot of friends within which each family has its separate dwelling-house, stable, and cattle-shed; and a number of such hamlets form a kishlak, or village. . . . The style of building does not differ throughout the country, and our quarters at Germ may be taken as a fair specimen of them all. The site is the slope of a hill, and a rivulet is usually not many paces from the door. Its course is here and there impeded by large whitened boulders, glassy--smooth from the constant action of running water; while its banks are shaded by a few gnarled walnut-trees, and the lawn adjoining planted in regular lines with the mulberry. Down in the bottom of the valley, where the rivulet falls into the larger stream, lie the scanty corn-lands of the little community. The mountains rise immediately behind the village, and their distant summits retain their snowy coverings throughout the greater portion of the year. An enclosure is formed by running a dry-stone wall round a space proportioned to the size and wealth of the family. The space thus enclosed is divided into compartments, the best of which form the dwelling-houses, whilst the others hold the stock. These latter compartments are usually sunk two feet under-ground, while the floors of the rooms for the family are elevated a foot or more above it: flat roofs extend over the whole. In the dwelling-house the smoke escapes by a hole in the middle of the roof, to which is fitted a wooden frame, to stop up the aperture when snow is falling. The rafters are lathed above and then covered with a thick coat of mud. If the room be large, its roof is supported by four stout pillars, forming a square, in the middle of the apartment, within which the floor is considerably lower than in the other parts, and the benches thus formed are either strewn with straw or carpeted with felts, and form the seats and bed-places of the family. The walls of the house are of considerable thickness: they are smoothly plastered inside with mud, and have a similar though rougher coating without. Where the slope of the hill is considerable, the enclosing wall is omitted and the upper row of houses are then over the roofs of the lower. Niches are left in the sides of the wall, and in these are placed many of the household utensils. The custom of relations grouping together has its advantages, but they are not unmixed. Many of the sorrows of the poor are thus alleviated by the kindness of friends: the closeness of their intercourse adds to their mutual sympathy; and when death occurs, the consolation which

is surrounded by a wall. In such a hamlet dwell families connected by blood often six to eight in number. Each of them has its separate division, enclosed again by a wall within the hamlet itself, with its own dwelling and rooms for the household.

Anyhow, in my opinion, the foundation of single farms was at least an exception. As a *primitive* form of settlement they occurred in Eastern Irān, at all events, as seldom as in other countries and with other peoples; and especially for this reason, that the settlers, at least as I believe, had first to conquer the land from hostile aborigines, against whom they could naturally defend themselves only when in sufficient number. Indeed, in low stages of civilization the dwelling together in a village offers eminent advantages. With the first seizing of a country the settlement is, therefore, everywhere by far more frequent than farm-like dwellings ¹.

Eastern Irān was, without doubt, partly at least, already conquered by the Indo-Irānian tribes. The first settlements go back to the Arian period and cannot therefore be conveniently designated as properly Irānian. But again, after the secession of the tribes, afterwards known as Indian, the Irānians, who remained, were by no means in a settled state. The battles with the aborigines continued also down to the Irānian period. In the spread of civilization there was no standing still. In the West particularly, cultivation was pushed more and more forward, and fresh soil was won. It is also certain that special Irānian families, as first settlers, often took considerable quantities of land into their possession, and a large number of primitive settlements owed them their origin.

When we have thus traced the rise of village communities from one another, the following question suggests itself as to the character of the Eastern Irānian village: Did the Irānians migrate in search of land in miscellaneous crowds and thus found settlements? or, had they already grouped themselves according to relationship and in tribes?

That the latter was the case is proved to a certainty. This word *vis* ² does not designate the village locally only, but at the same time also genealogically the race composed of several families. It is only in the original

the afflicted survivors receive from those near around them is great indeed. But to the newly married couple the benefits derived from this arrangement are frequently very dearly purchased; and the temper of the poor bride, it is to be feared, is often permanently damaged by the trials she has to undergo at the hands of a cross-grained mother-in-law. . . . Small as is the population in many of the valleys or narrow mountain glens, it is yet too great for the limited extent of their corn lands.'

¹ Roscher, *Nationalökonomik*, p. 252 seq.; Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge Roms*, p. 52.

² To the Av. *vis* corresponds Skr. *viç*; here it is important for the relation between the Irānian and Indian settlements that *viç* signifies in the Rîg-veda 'house, family race,' whilst 'village' is designated by *grāma*. Obviously the Indian village was principally a local bond, or at least, the identity of village and family is not more so manifest as among the Avesta people.

actual combination of both these ideas, when every race built and inhabited their own village, that the double meaning of the single word *vis* is intelligible.

Often enough, indeed, this state of things was only the ideal and not the actual one. The principle of relationship was obscured by purely accidental or local circumstances. It also happened that smaller tribes, not originally related, united themselves into a common settlement, or that neighbouring, though not kindred clans, were formed into a large community for practical reasons.

But even such communities were evidently organized very much according to the old bonds of tribe¹. The village of a clan formed the model according to which the new settlement was arranged and managed. The inhabitants of a village, founded by two or more families, then form only a single clan, under common direction, under *one* head. If such were not the case, it would be impossible that the two-fold signification of *vis* could have been preserved fresh throughout the entire literature of the Avesta.

The conditions of settlement of the Avesta people are therefore very various ; they are altogether adapted to the nature of the land in which those people dwelt. The village and farm systems existed side by side. Single farms were more rare and were found chiefly in mountain-valleys.

Villages were founded more frequently, and, indeed naturally, in more open and more fruitful districts. As such places were particularly found on the *transition rocks* in the deserts, and exposed to the pillaging incursions of the nomadic tribes, the villages were surrounded with walls and trenches.

In the positions where the Afghān towns are now situated, the conditions favourable to the rise of more extensive settlements exist to a certain extent. Here there were probably already in the Avesta epoch, fortified villages of such a dimension, that we may justly speak of them as the first step towards the formation of urban settlements.

As a primitive form of settlement the village was more common than the single farm. The villages were villages of races ; their inhabitants were bound together by ties of relationship. But it must be admitted that from the original single farm-house also, sometimes through the gradual growth of the family, the race-village has been developed.

¹ It seems to follow from the inscription of Behistan, I, 65, that, also in Western Irān the village of a clan was ordinary ; there we must translate *gaihāmchā.mānijāmchā. v'ithibishchā* apparently by 'the settlements and houses according to the races.' The Medes and Persians had, therefore, settled according to races or clans ; several related families formed the community of the village. Cf. Spiegel, *Altpersische Keilinschriften*, pp. 8-9.

CHAPTER V.

STATE AND LAWS.*

§ 1. *Constitution.*

IN all ages and countries the State has grown out of the family.¹ State and family were originally identical. All the relations, which subsist in family life between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants, have their counterparts in civil society. Here the relations between the sovereign and his people, between the government and its subjects, and frequently also between freemen and slaves, are similar in kind.

The family develops itself gradually into the clan, the clan into the tribe, the tribe into the nation. But actual political life only begins when the nation has made a permanent settlement in a fixed region, and territorial associations form a new tie binding families and races to the State.

It must be understood that the development of the nation does not proceed on the basis of races and tribes alone, but is equally influenced by territorial division. In proportion as the new influence gathers stability and vital power, the family loses its political importance and retains only that founded on private rights.

It is in this first stage of political existence that we find the Irānians of the Avesta. They are no longer herdsmen, or nomads, but settled agriculturists. Territorial distinctions, therefore, already appear, but not to such an extent that the old constitution of races and tribes is thereby disturbed and impaired.

In the Eastern Irānian State the *family* forms the fundamental unit of the political organization of the people.

The clan is made up of a number of kindred families, while the tribe is formed of a number of clans. The tribal system may have, likewise, developed itself so far in the case of the Irānians, that families and clans no longer restricted themselves to their natural members, but also admitted outsiders into their body. Clans numerically weak banded together for the purpose of securing their independence, while others perhaps divided themselves for economical reasons. However, the characteristic marks of clanship survived.

Every individual was only a member of the State in so far as he or she belonged to a particular family or clan. Individual citizens were not political units, but the family and the clan were; and the latter held a higher or lower

* Chapter VII. § 44, *Ostirānische Kultur*.

1 Cf. Arnold, "German Antiquity," pp. 310 *seq.*; Kaufmann, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. I. p. 113.

position in the State in proportion to their rank and influence. There were no civil officers other than the elders of the clan or tribe—a system which takes little account of personal merit or efficiency.

In the Avesta State a certain tendency to division and isolation cannot but be perceived, as might perhaps be expected from the nature of the country. Soil suitable for agricultural settlements is generally not to be found in large unbroken expanses, but in isolated tracts and parcels. A community, which occupies such a spot, forms to a certain extent a state by itself, being separated from other communities by high and almost inaccessible mountain-ranges and by dreary deserts.

In fact, the more tenaciously the Eastern Irānian clings to the narrow circle of his blood-relations, the less developed is his sympathy with the State and its interests. Religion alone forms a tie sufficiently strong to bind one community to another. It plays a far more important part than national cohesion.

It is, indeed, characteristic that the Avesta language does not even contain a word descriptive of the people as a political body. Even the old Indian word *jana*¹ in the passages where it appears in contradistinction to the term "sovereign" or "king," approaches this meaning far more nearly than any word in the Avesta.

The Eastern Irānian village was an aggregation of families. It consisted of several farm-houses, each of which was inhabited by family. Possibly also the families most closely related formed within the village a compact group or a special quarter,² as is the case at the present day amongst the Kishlāks of the Badakhshāni.

¹ Comp. Zimmer, *AltL.* pp. 158-159.

² A similar circumstance is in my opinion indicated by *qatu* which occurs together with *verezēna* (another form is *verezāna*) and *airyaman* in Ys. XXXIII. 3 and 4, XLIX. 7. The traditional translation of that word is the Phlv. *Khvēshīh* = Mod. Pers. *Khēshī* "relation, consanguinity." Compare also *qazthrō-datha*, "marriage of relations. *Verezēna* corresponds strikingly with the Skr. *vrjāna*, "village-community" (just as *grāma*). However, the identity of these two words is contested by many. Skr. *vrjāna* means originally "enclosure," then "hurdle, enclosed village." This fundamental meaning cannot but be supposed to be involved in the Ir. *verezēna*, since *varez* always means only "to work." I may here refer to the Mod. Pers. *barziyar*, "husbandman" and *barzan*, "*vicius, urbis, mansion*." *Verezēna* then came to denote the village as an association of colonists that follow agriculture. The word approaches its original signification "work, care," in *āthrō-verezēnē*, "care (tending), cult of the fire," (Ys. XXXVI. 1); the same idea is indeed expressed in *ashalyā-verezēnē*, (Ys. XXXV. 8). More certainly does the word *verezāna* designate the village in the passage where it is used with the word *maethana*, "farm-house." (Yt. X. 80; Comp. also Yt. X. 116), just as in the phrase *ashā frādh.verezēnā* (Ys. XXXIV. 14), which is the same as the *ashā-frādh. gaethāo*.—A wider confederation, probably the union of neighbouring village-communities into a common league, offensive and defensive, is to be understood by *airyaman*. This meaning of the word is clear when it occurs along with *hakhe-man*, "friendship."

At all events the smallest divisions of the State were looked upon as being at once local and political. They had, therefore, a real and tangible importance in connection with the daily life of the people. The *house* or *farm* was identical with the *family*, the *village* with the *clan*. According to traditional accounts fifteen families were sufficient to form a clan or village-community; but I suspect that this minimum existed in theory rather than in practice.

The *clans* or *Vis* traced their descent from a common ancestor. The clan as such was called by his name; but in the course of a generation the same name was also again applied to single individuals.

One of the most renowned races in the Avesta is the Āthwyanian which evidently derives its origin from the half-legendary hero *Āthwya*. From it the hero Thraitāna, the conqueror of Azhi Dahāka, derives his descent.¹ I would mention also the race of the Nautarids, to which Kavi Vishtāspa belongs. His wife, Hutausa, is also included in it, wives being admitted into the clans of their husbands.² Finally, from the race of the Hvōvids descends Jāmāspa, one of the first men who declared for the religion of Zarathushtra. . . .

The *tribe*, called *Zantu*, was evidently an almost abstract conception. It is not mentioned by itself in the Avesta, but only as included in the system of the Zoroastrian constitution.

The expressions *gaētu*, *verezēna* and *airyaman*, evidently refer to the moral relation of the individual families to each other. The proper technical names for the constitution of the tribe are: 1, *Nmāna*, "house, family"; 2, *Vis*, "village, clan, race"; 3, *Zantu*, "tribe"; 4, *Dānu* or *Daqu*, "country." For the two first *vide supra*, pp. 267-268 and 271. *Zantu* is derived from the root *zan*, "to generate, to bring forth"; Skr. *Jantu* "descendant, race, tribe." The political organization is not altogether identical with that of the Vedic Arians. Amongst the latter the different classifications are called *Jana*, *Viç Grāma* or *Vrjāna*, which, according to Zimmer (*AltL.* pp. 158 *seq.*), respectively denote "tribe (single nation), country and village". The last one is composed of individual families. Hence we see that the old Arian people were, indeed, likewise organized according to consanguinity and race, primarily into the separate nations, of Irānians and Indians and hence was developed an extremely legal and permanent political organization. . . .

Dānu corresponds literally to the Vedic *dasyu*, which designates the non-Arian aborigines of the Panjāb. The relation of both these terms and their meanings is as follows: The primitive Arian word denoted, as does also its cognate *dāsa*, hostile tribes. The Indian *dasyu* retained that signification, and served subsequently as a name for the enemies of the gods or demons. But the Irānians understood by the term *Dānu*, the land rescued from enemies, or country in general; even the Mod. Pers. *dih*, which is purely topographical, signifies a village. The Latin *provincia* may be conveniently suggested for comparison. We have a striking compound word in *dānu-pāperetāna*, "battle of the (for the? countries)", which most vividly reminds us of the Skr. *dasyu-hatya*. Lassen, *I.A.* vol. I) pp. 633 *seq.*; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. p. 544; vol. II. p. 241; Zimmer, *AltL.* pp. 109 *seq.*

¹ "Unto her, the Anāhita, offered * the offspring of the Athwyanian race, * the offspring of the mighty race, Thraitāna," Yt. V. 33; IX. 13; XV. 23; XVII. 33; comp. Ys. IX. 7.

² Yt. V. 98, *vide Supra*. p. 176. Yt. XV. 35: "Unto him, the Rūman, implored Hutausa, who was rich in brothers, and of the race of the Nautarids."

We cannot, moreover, represent by the tribe in the old Irānian State a large and independent portion of the people, following its own course of development. The word *Zantu* only denoted a certain number of families and clans which were more closely united amongst themselves than with others, which probably derived their descent from the same ancestor, and which had, I believe, emigrated together before they settled in the country.

Local circumstances exercised far greater influence than the more theoretical union of the tribe. At all events, with the foundation of permanent settlements, one race was easily divided from another, and the nation became a confederacy of distinct races. The theory as such was retained, but in reality the situation of the different village-communities played a far more important part in practical life. The closer pursuit of agriculture in many districts, the distributions of water over the fields, the construction of canals and trenches for irrigation, as well as the right of pasture also necessitated an adjustment of the relations between the individual communities.

Hence, instead of the 'tribe,' or, as the phrase also occurs, of the 'race and tribe,' the purely local idea of the 'settlement' or of the 'district' appears already in the *Gāthās*. By this is evidently meant the territory with all its settlements occupied by one or more races.

"Accordingly I ask Thee how the bounteous one, who desires the mastery over an estate.

Or over a district, or over a country, in order to propagate piety,

As a man devoted to Thee, O Mazda Ahura : how he must be and how he must act ?"

"None of you shall listen to the words and precepts of the vicious ;

For he will bring unto his house, and unto his village, unto his district and unto his country, grief and death."

"(Nay), beat them down with the weapon !"¹

Finally, the *country* or *Daqyu* appears to be of geographical rather than of political significance. The term "countries" stands for land in general ; "Thou art the worst and the best at the same time, O Mithra, for men ! Thou commandest over peace and discord, O Mithra, in the countries !"²

The land of the Avesta people was divided into several countries, for which reason the Arian countries are always spoken of in the plural. Mention is also made of the countries belonging to the non-Arians and to the *Tūrānians*.

¹ Ys. XXXI. 16, (*umāna, shōithra, daqyu*) and 18 (*umāna, vis, shōithra, daqyu*). For the second passage comp. *supra*, p. 118.

² Yt. X. 29.

This is quite consistent, as the "country" meant originally the districts snatched from the enemy, and we are free to conclude hence that the tribes of foreign race had the same system of clanship as the Arians.

The individual village-communities, as well as the countries themselves, seem to have been independent of each other, and, as a rule, to have followed their own line of policy. Occasionally, however, they also formed themselves into a larger confederation, particularly, I believe, when they were required to beat off some common external enemy.¹

A tribal system, similar to that which the Eastern Irānians possessed, according to the description of the Avesta, existed also in Western Irān. This we may infer from the statements of Herodotus and of the old Persian Cuneiform inscriptions.

The Medes were divided into six, the Persians into ten subdivisions or tribes. Each tribe contained in itself several clans, each clan a number of distinct families. Such a clan amongst the Persians was that of the Achāmenids, from which descended the Great Kings, who consequently may have been originally, also, the elders of clans and tribes.²

The finer distinction of the Avesta between a tribe and a country, a *Zantu* and a *Dagyu*, besides being of no practical value, appears even to have been unknown in Western Irān. Here they understood by the "tribe" evidently a comprehensive union, which, as was frequently the case with the Germans, coincided with the country; for the tribe was the genealogical, the country the geographical, designation for the same division of the State.

How much the culture of a nation is influenced by the natural features of its territory is clearly observed in the old Irānian State as composed of races. To this potent factor we may ascribe the preservation of the same constitution up to the present time amongst the tribes of Irān, which have remained untouched by civilization, in the midst of the Afghāns, Lūrs and Kurds.

¹ Thus we must, I believe, explain *airgaman* (*vide supra*, p. 200, note), and *danhusasti* (Ys. LII. 5 and Yt. X. 87). The latter name represents a more comprehensive union in the list, after house, village, tribe and country.

² Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. II. pp. 237-238. *Vide* Herodotus, I. 101, 125. The technical terms used in the Avesta, in the Cuneiform Inscriptions and in Herodotus, are the following :—

Avesta.	Cuneiform Inscriptions.	Herodotus.
1. <i>danhu</i>	} <i>dagyush</i>	γέυος.
2. <i>zantu</i>		
3. <i>vīs</i>	<i>v'ith</i>	φρῆ'τρῆ
4. <i>umāna</i>	<i>māniya</i>

The first of the tribes named above is the most important for us, since it partly dwells in the territory of the Avesta people.

Among the Afghāns the family has the same political importance that it had in ancient days.¹ It forms the basis of the entire national organization of the people; but the State is rather more developed in its details. We cannot simply distinguish, as in the case of the Avesta people, three concentric circles which have the family as the central point, but generally four or even five, so that our terms—"country," "tribe," and "race"—are no longer sufficient.

The Afghān *Khail* or "clan" appears chiefly to correspond to the *Vis* or *clan* of the Avesta people. But the *Khails* are no doubt proportionally more considerable. They spread themselves as a rule over several villages, and often comprehend a very considerable number of families.

Several clans form again a larger group. This is particularly the case with the Bannu Afghāns, whose extensive alliances concluded for mutual defence, are called *Gundi*². With the latter I might compare the *Zantu* or *tribe of the Avesta*.

The great leading tribes of the Afghāns, such as the Dūrānī, Ghilzai, Khaiberī, Yūsufzāi, may be regarded as corresponding in some measure to the *Daqyus* or *countries*, a supposition which is warranted chiefly by the fact that they are really divided from each other according to territory.

The country of the Dūrānī is bounded on the North by that of the Aimāk and Hezūr, towards the West and South-West it touches the desert, in the south it reaches the district of Shōrāwak and the Khoja-Amrān mountains. Northward of the Dūrānī dwell the Ghilzai on the Upper Arghandāb and Tarnak, and along the banks of the river Lāgar as far as the Panjir.

The Khaiberī occupy the eastern spurs of the Sefid-Kōh. The Yusufzai inhabit the plains of Peshāwur as well as the valleys of the rivers running from the North into the Kābul-rūd.

In order briefly to describe the Afghān constitution as it holds among the Dūrānīs and to illustrate ancient institutions by modern practice, we may mention that they are sub-divided into two principal divisions and nine tribes. Each tribe is composed of a number of races or clans and families.

The Popalzai form a tribe of the Dūrānīs, the Saddozai a clan of the Popalzai. From a family of the Saddozai was descended the founder of the Afghān power.

¹ With what follows compare Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. I. pp. 310, *seq.*

² Compare Gerland in Thorburn, *Globus*, XXXI. 1877, p. 315.

The Bannu Afghāns are also divided into numerous *Khails* or clans. Each clan consists of several village-communities, each village-community again of several families.

Like the political organization of the Avesta people, their government is also patriarchal.

The *master of the house* is the head of each house or of each individual family; the *master of the clan or village* superintends the clan or the village, and is perhaps selected from amongst the *patres-familias*. But it is far more probable that the headman of the leading oldest family of the race held that dignity *ipso facto*.

The *master of the tribe* is the chief of the *Zantu* or "tribe." Lastly, the *prince or sovereign of the country* is the head of the country. They also possibly owed their dignity to election; or perhaps enjoyed it in consequence of the position in the tribe occupied by their clans and their families¹.

All authority in the Avesta State was evidently analogous to the dignity and legal power possessed by the *pater-familias* in his household. It is a remarkable fact that the Shirānī, an Afghān tribe inhabiting the Suleimān mountains, designate their chief, who is always the head of the oldest family,² by the title of *Niku*, "little grand-father."

We will not err if we assume that the greatest influence was directly exercised by the master of the house and the elder of the clan or village. A similar state of things still exists amongst those tribes of modern Irān, which have preserved their ancient constitution. Amongst them each family, each clan and each tribe has, as in the case of the Avesta people, its own head—a condition of things which savours strongly of republicanism. The chiefs of the different tribes possess as a rule more power and influence than the king.³

For success in his more important enterprises the Amir of Afghānistān depends entirely upon the greater or less good-will of the tributary princes, who are nominally subordinate to him. The individual tribes are altogether independent. Even the most powerful princes are content when the tribes only bind themselves to pay an insignificant tribute, and to take the field on their behalf in case of war.

¹ Their names in the Avesta dialect are:—*nmānō-paiti*, "master of the house" (also *nmānya*); *vis-paiti*, "master of the village or clan" (also *visya*); *zantu-paiti*, "master of the tribe" (also *zātuna*); *danhu-paiti*, "master of the country" (also *daqquma*). The same chiefs are again and again mentioned; as in Yt. X. 83-84; "Him, Mithra, does the master of the country implore with uplifted hands for help, him the master of the tribe, him the master of the village, him the master of the house." Comp. Yt. X. 17, 18; Vsp. III. 2; Vd. VII. 41, 42; Ys. IX. 27, &c.

² See *Globus*, vol. XXXI. 1877, p. 333. Cf. also Elphinstone, "Kabul," vol. II. pp. 24 seq. on the Afghān clans and their government.

³ Spiegel *E. A.* vol. II, p. 240.

The Afghāns of Bannu have generally no common Khān. Each village population selects its own *Malik*, who collects certain taxes, out of which, however, the public expenses are to be defrayed. The *Khails*, too, select their own *Malik*, who is distinguished by his power or noble birth. The *Gundis* also have their own leader, whilst no higher central authority is known.¹

The State management which obtains among the Kafirs, appears to be the most primitive of all. Here the entire government consists in a sort of patriarchal control exercised by the heads of certain families. However, the powers of such elders are very limited.²

We may safely believe that the sovereigns of "countries" lived in a style of extreme simplicity. The type of such patriarchal rulers is *Yima*, "the rich in flocks." We may infer from the epithet thus applied to him, that this prince was, like his subjects, devoted to agriculture and cattle-breeding, and was distinguished from them only by his larger fields and flocks.

The country-princes principally display their activity in war. They are also, therefore, called "the armed rulers."³

"The country-princes pray unto him (Mithra), when they draw themselves up in line of battle against the terrible armies, against those gathered thus together for fighting in the war of the country."⁴

Vadhaghna and *Arvasāra*, the opponents of *Kavi Husrava*,⁵ are styled "country-princes." The *Yazatas* also receive this title of honour, especially Mithra, who is even called the "provincial lord of all the countries," because he rules as the *Sun-Yazata* from heaven over the entire world.⁶

Another appellation for the master of a country is *Sāstar*, "the ruler."⁷ The *Sāstar* also displays his power in the field:

"Mithra surveys the whole Arian-land, the most blissful, where armed rulers command excellent troops."⁸

The identity of the *Sāstars* with the country-princes is proved by their title of all-commanding rulers of the country.⁹ If such a one duly adores the Fravashis, who manifest their aid chiefly in battle, he will attain special power.¹⁰ They are principally the *manes* who protect the ruler in every difficulty.

¹ *Globus*, vol. XXXI. 1877, p. 317.

² "Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society," vol. II. 1880, p. 251.

³ *Thwām. Yazāontē . aurvāoghō Ahūrāoghō dn̄hu-patāyō*. Yt. V. 85.

⁴ Yt. X. 8. ⁵ Vd. XIX 6; Yt. XV. 31.

⁶ Yt. X. 78.—*Mithrem. vispanām. daqyunām. dan̄hu-paitīm*. Yt. X. 145. Comp. Ys. I. 11.

⁷ *Sāstare* from the root *sāo~h*=Skr. *śas*, "to command."

⁸ Yt. X. 13-14.

⁹ *Sāsta. dan̄hēush. hāmō-khshathrō*.

¹⁰ "If (anybody) makes good offerings * unto the *fravashis* of the pious,* he will become an all-commanding ruler of the country,* the most powerful prince among mankind," Yt. XIII. 18.

“When hostile antagonists pursue the all-commanding ruler of the country; and when he (*the latter*) implores the bold *fravashis* of the pious; then they come to his protection.”¹

Such is the position which the Sāstar holds in the Yashts. Here he is clearly the country-prince so far as he is the commander-in-chief of the army.

An entirely different picture is more strikingly exhibited in the Yasna and the Vendidad. In these books the Sāstar is considered as a wicked being, an inimical tyrant full of death and destruction.

“Against the body of the vicious man, of the malicious *sāstar*, throw thy weapon, O golden Hauma! to favour the threatened pious people.”²

So early as in the Gāthās is this antipathy to the Sāstars observed,³ and we might almost believe that we here touch upon the traces of a conflict between the priesthood and the political power. This antique “*Kulturkampf*,” however, must have gradually died out. In the Yashts, composed in latter times and especially for the use of the laity, this antagonism seems to have entirely disappeared.

The title *Khshathra*, “sovereign,” is also very ancient, and is found even in the sacred Gāthās. It is before the Khshathras that Zarathushtra and his immediate adherents and followers proclaim the new religion. Whether they will decide in its favour is the most striking and important question:

“Therefore I ask Thee, give me truly answer, O Ahura:
How shall I maintain my doctrine purer,
Which is to be proclaimed before the bounteous sovereign
As the true principedom and the right doctrine by Thy adherent, O Mazda,
Who dwells amongst the settlers piously and goodmindedly?”⁴

The Khshathras are not always inclined to embrace the Mazda-religion. They adhere sometimes to false priests, the *Kavis* and *Karapans*, instead of listening to the precepts of the Zoroastrian sages. As a punishment for their stubbornness they are threatened with eternal damnation.⁵

¹ Yt. XIII. 69-70. *Avi-spashitō*, “threatened by an ambush”: from *avi-spas*, literally “to glance at somebody.”

² Ys. IX. 31. Comp. *Yo . masyō . drevāo . sāsra*, Vd. XXI. 1; IV. 49; Ys. LXV. 8. —*Sāstrahēcha, pouru-mahrkahē*, Ys. LXI. 4; LXVIII. 8.

³ *Nādhā . dagyūsh . yōi . sāsārō . dregvantō*, occurring in a difficult passage, Ys. XLVI. 1.

⁴ Ys. XLIV. 9. Cf. *Supra*. p. 266. Also compare Vsp. 1. 9: “I lay out the offering and make it known to the lord of the country, who is devoted to Ahura”, (*Ahurōish . dagyumahē*.)

⁵ Ys. XLVI. 11; XLIX. 11; comp. *Supra*. pp. 175-177.

Good and bad princes are sharply distinguished :—

“ Good princes shall rule over us, but no wicked princes.

With deeds of good wisdom, O Ārmatī ! ” ¹

“ When will O Mazda ! the men of wisdom step forth ?

When will they drive away the filth of intoxication ;

Of which vice the false priests are proud,

And of which the wicked rulers of countries boast ? ” ²

Grēhma appears to have been such a prince, hostile to the Zoroastrian religion.³ On the other hand, the princes like Vishtāspa and Jāmāspa are extolled as the first adherents of Zarathushtra.⁴

The country-princes were independent of each other. But it also happened occasionally that a powerful potentate acquired supremacy over several or all the Arian countries. This is particularly mentioned of Kavi Husrava, the Kai Khosrav of the Shāhnāme, who is likewise, therefore, called in the Avesta the hero who united the Arian countries into an empire.⁵

In like manner Haushyangha, Yima and Kavi Usan address the following prayer to Ardvi-sūra : “ Grant, O most blissful Anāhita, that I may become the supreme ruler over all the countries of demons and men ! ” ⁶

The dominion of village-elders and of country-princes was not absolute.

Among the Afghāns, the heads of families as well as the *Maliks* of village-communities and of clans, meet together in an assembly, which has the right to impose penalties and to adjust differences, and which thus curbs the power of the head *Malik*.

Popular assemblies are also known amongst the Lures and even amongst the wildest tribes of the Kurds⁷. They are evidently very old institutions, and at the same time an organic element in the constitution of the tribe.

Of Yima it is related in the Avesta that he convoked an assembly of the best among men.⁸ This assembly was also graced by the presence of Ahura Mazda and the good genii. Ahura Mazda announced unto Yima the impending deluge and gave him the necessary counsel, how to escape from that danger with his people.

¹ Ys. XLVIII. 5. The emendation of the first line : *Hukshathrū . nē.mā . dushkhshathrū . khshayantū*, was first suggested by Roth. (Cf. C. de Harlez, *Av. tr.* II. p. 147, note).

² Ys. XLVIII. 10. *Dushkhshathrū . daqqunām* . strikingly reminds us of *sūsta . dānhēush*. ³ Ys. XXXII. 12-14.

⁴ Ys. II. 16 ; XLIX. 9 (cf. also Ys. XLVI, 14 *seq* ; LIII. 2.)

⁵ *Arshā . airyanām . daqqunām . khshathrū . hañkeremō*, Yt. V. 49 ; IX. 21 ; XV. 32.

⁶ *Yatha . basāni . upemem . khshathrem . vīspanām . daqqunām . daēvanām . mash-yānāmcha*, apparently meaning “ the non-Arians and the Arians,” Yt. V. 22, 26, 46.

⁷ Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. II. p. 240. Cf. also *Globus*, XXXI. 1877, p. 332.

⁸ *Hañjamamem . frabaratu . yō . Yimō . khshaētō . hvāthwō*, Vd. II. 21. Also *vyākha* is an expression used for the “ assemblage of the people,” from root *vyach*.

Here we have clearly before us the description of an old country-prince and how he holds solemn council with the nobles of his tribe regarding some important event.

The assemblies were, it seems, opened with prayer, in fact, with the *Ahuna-varya* formula,¹ whereby the help of the Divine Spirit was invoked and the pernicious influence of evil was averted.

A man, whose word is of weight in council, is highly estimated by the people :—

“Through the power and glory of the *fravashis* an able man rises in the assembly, a counsellor of convincing speech, who possesses the longed-for wisdom, who will protect his countryman seeking his help, anticipating his request : ”²

For this reason one prays also to the Fravashis:—“In my house may there be herds of cattle and troops of men, swift horses, strong chariots, and an able adviser.” “Able in council” is likewise an honourable characteristic of posterity. Mithra, the all-seeing *sun-yazata* too, enjoys the same title, which is evidently regarded by the Irānians generally as expressing the ideal of manly capacity.³

§ 2. War and Military Concerns.

The peace of the Avesta nation was chiefly endangered by the plundering inroads of the northern barbarians⁴. Indeed, no effectual military precautions could be taken against such foes,⁵ save to be always on the watch and to parry attacks as skilfully as possible. However, regular campaigns were not unknown. The Arians undertook wars against the enemies of their tribes, partly, it appears for the sake of conquest, and partly by way of retaliation for pillaging incursions.⁶

Internal dissensions were also, I believe, frequent amongst the Arians themselves, for social and religious differences were common. It was, therefore, a matter of honour for every man to be always brave and warlike.⁷

In the field every head of a family was accompanied by his *followers*, who, I am inclined to believe, chiefly consisted of grown-up sons ; however, the able-bodied servants must also have accompanied their master in war ; and, the larger the number of his followers, the more important naturally was his position in the camp. “Troops of heroes” are, therefore, in addition to cattle and fields, one of the principal objects of desire to the Irānian.

¹ Yt. XI. 3-4.

² Yt. XIII. 16. I believe, we should read the third verse thus :—
vyākhmō . hugushayat . ukhdhō.

³ Yt. XIII. 52 ; Ys. LXII. 5 ; Yt. X. 65.

⁴ *Ākhshti*, “peace” ; *anākhshti*, “discord.”

⁵ “Enemy,” *dushmainyu*, *tishvat*, Yt. X. 11 ; *haretha*, Yt. X. 34 ; *verethrā* just as Skr. *vṛtra*, Ys. XLIV. 16.

⁶ Yt. X. 8 ; cf. *supra*. p. 127.

⁷ *Yuidhishta*, *Yāhin*.

"Give strength and victory, give herds that create prosperity, give a troop of heroes, able and eloquent, victorious and unconquered, who may overpower the opponents, who may subdue the enemies, who may bless the people and protect their race!"¹

The organization of the army was of course based on no other principle than the constitution of the State during peace. The family constituted the military as it did the political unit. The warriors ranged themselves family by family and clan by clan, the ties of relationship being thus regarded as the most stable bond of union in the moment of danger.²

Armies were modelled after the same pattern by the Indians, with whom the expression "village-community" meant exactly a troop of warriors.³ The same was also the case amongst the old Germans:—

"The armed nation was at the same time the army, for army and nation were synonymous, and only the invalids, children, women and old men were excluded from military service. In the most ancient times the case was similar with every nation, and it was so much the more believed to be indispensable by the Germans, as their tribes had to be necessarily organized in a warlike manner when on their migrations. Also there were wandering armies which had to be ready every moment for defence."

"The sub-divisions of the people into countries, hundreds, and communities, therefore, constitute the sections of the army; or, as we can say perhaps more correctly, the divisions of the nation owed their origin inversely to its military organization. Here the relationship and union of races were of course taken into consideration as much as possible, for, as we learn from Tacitus, the nearest relatives among the old Germans stood together also in battle."⁴

The task of leading the army devolved on the country-prince. He had to take care that the army was properly arrayed in ranks, since the Irānians did not fight, like barbarians, in irregular masses, but already to a certain extent in drilled battalions.⁵

¹ Nyūj. III. 10. Cf. *vīryām-īśtīm, vīryām-vāthwām*, &c., Yt. VIII. 15; XIII. 52 and the compound form *pasu-vīra*, Ys. XLV. 9, LVIII. 6.

² Yt. XIII. 67 may be cited as a proof (*vide supra*, p. 180).

³ Zimmer, *AltL.* pp. 160-161. In the Avesta the army is called *ura*—Skr. *vṛā*. The latter particularly designates a sub-division of the *viç*.

⁴ Arnold, "German Antiquity" (3) pp. 286-287; cf. Kaufmann, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. I. p. 121, Tacitus, *Germ.* 7: "*Quod præcipuum fortitudinis incitamentum est, non casus neque fortuita congloratio turmam aut cuneum facit, sed familie et propinquitates.*"

⁵ Cf. *supra* pp. 286-287; Yt. X. 14; *Sāstārō aurva . . . ūrō.rāzayīnti* (Skr. *rāj* "to rule, to command"). The "battle" is *hamarana* (Yt. XIII. 31) = Skr. *samarāṣa*; or *peshana* (*dahnu-pāperetāna*) = Skr. *pṛtanū*. The "line of battle" is *areza* (Yt. X. 8 and 36, XIII. 33) or *rasman* (Yt. V. 68, X. 47); Comp. *rasmanō . hāmatāiti*, "the drawing up of the army in files," Yt. XIII. 39. "Army" = *spāṭha*, Mod. Pers. *sipāh*.

The use of banners or military ensigns, too, points to a certain tactical order in the field. It is intended, I believe, to indicate the military skill and capacity of the inhabitants of *Bākhdi* when that city receives in the Avesta the epithet "with highly-raised banners."¹ It is also said of the Fravashis, who are active in battle, that they bear military ensigns.

Before the battle rages the divine spirits are invoked for assistance. "The country-princes pray unto Mithra, when they go to battle."² In fact, they owe their victory to the strength and aid of the celestial ones.

"Therefore I ask Thee, give me truly answer, O Ahura :

Whether Thou commandest over it in holiness,

When the two armies silently dash together,

According to those doctrines, which Thou, Mazda, wouldst have
us adhere to :

How and to which of the two Thou wilt grant the victory ? " ³

A war-song, the author of which imagines himself to be on the eve of a bloody battle, is preserved in the Avesta :

" May the two exalted friends

Come to our help,

When the swords raise their din (*i. e., clash*) loudly,

When the horses' nostrils snort,

When the daggers gleam, and the strings

Send forth sharp arrows :

Then shall the sons of God's contemners

Be hurled headlong ! " ⁴

The swaying of the battle from one side to the other is compared to the conflux of mighty waters, especially to that of the Voru-kasha. "There quiver all the flanks, there shakes the entire middle, when flows into it, when streams into it the Ardvī-sūra Anāhita." ⁵

Now is the time for the *Yazatas* to render support and vigorous help. It is principally the Fravashis and Mithra, who now display their might.⁶

¹ *Drafsha*, "banner"; *eredhvō-drafsha*, Vd. I. 7.

² Yt. X. 8.

³ Ys. XLIV. 15.

⁴ Yt. X. 113. By the "two friends" (Av. *Mithra*) are implied Ahura and Mithra. "God's contemners" is a free rendering. The text has *gouru-zaothranām*, "of those who bring odious offerings." The expression might be changed into *gouru-zaothra*, in order to suit the metre, so that *hunavō* may perhaps be translated "the Hunus."

⁵ Yt. V. 4. The metaphor is taken from the waving of the line of battle, *karana* i the flank, the wing; *maidhya*, the middle, the centre. Cf. Yt. X. 36, XIII. 39.

⁶ Yt. XIII. 17, 31, 37-38, 66-67. Vide *supra*. p. 186.

"Mithra opens the war, he joins in the combat; standing in the fight he shatters the lines arrayed for battle. There stagger all the flanks of the army led to the fight; he (Mithra) puts to flight the whole centre of the blood-stained army of the enemy."¹

Respecting their *equipment in war* it may be mentioned that offensive weapons were more in use than defensive armour. However, the latter was not quite unknown.

The Tūrānian prince, Frangrasyan, wears a coat-of-mail made of brass. The Fravashis are *metaphorically* conceived as clad in brazen armour, apparently after the manner of heavy-armed warriors on earth. Mithra as the *Yuzata of light* is clad in a gold coat-of-mail.²

We do not err if we assume that brazen armour was used especially by those who fought on chariots. In their exposed position they stood more in need of protection than other combatants. Only people of rank, who belonged to the military nobility, fought from chariots. The rest of the nation fought probably on foot around them. Cavalry, too, were even known to a certain extent.³

The most valuable property of the "chariot-warriors" consisted naturally in their steeds, for whose strength and vigour they prayed.⁴ "Famous through chariots" is a term of praise bestowed upon the horse.⁵ The princes are called "possessors of snorting steeds and of rumbling chariots."⁶ The wheel of the chariot seems to have been regarded among the Irānians, as is known to have been the case among the Indians, as the symbol of world-conquering power. At least it is said of Zarathushtra that he first of all made the wheel roll over the demons and *wicked* sons of men, that his empire embraced Arians and non-Arians.⁷

All this indicates that the chariot-warriors were a distinct section of the army. During battle they played a part similar to that of the Homeric heroes and the old Persian champions in the descriptions of Firdausi. They

¹ Yt. X. 36 (cf. X. 39). The same is said of *Verthraghna*, Yt. XIV. 62, and of *Srausha* Ys. LVII. 12.

² Ys. XI. 7 speaks of Frangrasyan as *ayaghah-pairish-hvakhta*; Yt. XIII. 45 represents the *fravashis* to be *ayō-verethra* (this epithet is proved to be a later addition for the sake of restoring the original metre); Yt. X. 112 says of Mithra that he was *zaranyō-vārethman*; also *vāreman*, (Yt. V. 130) = Skr. *varman*, meaning perhaps a "coat-of-mail." Cf., however, *supra*. p. 71, note |

³ Comp. *supra*. I. p. 229.

⁴ Comp. *supra*. I. p. 228.

⁵ *Sraoratha*, Yt. X. 30; formed like *sraotanu*.

⁶ *Fraothar-aspa* and *qanat-chakhra*, Yt. V. 130.

⁷ *Chakhrēm . urvāsayata*, Yt. XIII. 89. The phrase at once reminds us of Skr. *chakram . vartay* (Grassmann, *Wtb. sub voce*) and *chakravartin*, "one who causes his chariot-wheels to roll freely over all countries; the Ruler of the Universe" (*B.R. sub voce*). However, *vrt* and *urvā* cannot possibly be identified in sound.

could rarely, however, have taken part in a general *mêlée*; it is more likely that before the opposing armies joined battle, the chariot-warriors on both sides challenged one another to single combat; or, perhaps in the midst of the fray, they looked for opponents of equal rank, whom they could match in courage and military skill.

Each chariot combatant was accompanied by a charioteer. To the latter was entrusted a task scarcely less honourable or important than that of the former. Skilful management of the chariot was not less essential to success than the skill and valour of the warrior himself.

The charioteer in old Irân was for that reason not the servant but the devoted friend and companion of the combatant¹, as was the case among the Indians of the Vedic and the Achâians of the Homeric periods.

According to the Rig-veda, the princess Mudgalānī drives in battle the team of her husband Mudgala². In the Iliad, Stenelos, son of Capaneus, is the charioteer of Diomedes. Æneas himself holds the reins for Pandaros, as the latter strives to wound the raging Diomedes. On a *single* chariot stand the two sons of Priam, the bastard Antiphus and the legitimate son Isus, the former as charioteer, the latter as combatant. Similarly, the two sons of Antimachus, Pisander and Hippolochus. Cebriones, a natural son of Priam, is Hector's charioteer. As Hector alights from his chariot in order to storm the wall, Cebriones, too, places himself in the ranks of the combatants. Nor is the chariot entrusted to an inferior. Patroclus is called the charioteer of Achilles, and Cōranos, the friend and charioteer of Meriones³.

The Vendidād describes in one passage the equipment of the chariot-warrior. In this list there are also enumerated the several kinds of defensive armour, the coat-of-mail, gorget, beaver, helmet, belt, and cuisses.⁴

The *coat-of-mail* protects the breast from cuts and thrusts. We cannot be positive as to the pattern. It may have consisted either of metallic scales or rings of brass.⁵

¹ Yt. V. 131: "I pray to thee for the two-armed ones, O Anāhita, for one two-legged and for one four-legged: for the two-legged, who might swiftly approach the chariot and be forward in assailing it in battle; but for the four-legged who might crush both the wings of the enemy's army, that fight in the broad front, in his flight to the left and to the right, to the right and to the left." It is plainly the wish of a chariot-warrior for a swift charioteer, and for a strong team of horses. We do not avail ourselves of the double meaning of the expression *Ava . aurvañta*. *Aurvat* evidently means just the same as Vedic *Arvat*, the lancer as well as the horse.

² Rv. 10. 102. 2. Comp. also Zimmer, *AtL*. p. 269.

³ Iliad, Bk. III. ll. 367, 403 *seq.*; Bk. V. ll. 107 *seq.*, ll. 239 *seq.*, ll. 217 *seq.*; Bk. XI. ll. 101 *seq.*, ll. 122 *seq.*, ll. 521 *seq.*; Bk. XVI. ll. 726 *seq.*; Bk. XII. ll. 91-92; Bk. XVII. ll. 426 616 *seq.*

⁴ *Zrādha*, *kviri*, *paiti-dāna*, *sāravāra* (from *sāra*, "head", and *vāra* from rt. *var*, "to protect"), *kamara* (=Mod. Pers. *kamar*), *rāna-pāna* (literally "the thigh-protecting"). See Vd. XIV. 9.

⁵ This is confirmed by the Mod. Pers. word *zirah*, which especially denotes a coat-of-mail, as well as by the derivation of *zrādha* from rt. *zrād*=Skr. *hrād*, "to clatter." In Sanskrit *hrādīn* means "the warrior," also "the thunderbolt of Indra," *hrāda*, "the noise or clanging."

Respecting the *helmet*, we do not know whether it was made of leather or of metal. At all events metal ones were not unknown. Helmets of brass were worn by the Fravashis as well as by Vayu, the *wind-yazata*, and by Mithra. It is *allegorically* said that Vayu wore a golden, Mithra a silver, helmet¹.

The *gorget* probably connected the cuirass with the helmet. The *beaver* covered, as a sort of visor, the lower part of the face; the *cuisse*s the thigh. The *bell* served, I believe, as among the Achæians, not merely to support the sword but also at the same time to protect the body.

Regarding the use of the *shield* we learn very little from the Avesta. Apparently it was only seldom used. At all events the *yazata* Ashi and the Fravashis are represented as shield-bearers.²

We have abundant allusions to offensive weapons.

The most ancient was the *club*³. Every knotted piece of wood could serve as such. Plates or knobs of metal were used to increase its tremendous weight. Clubs are the special weapon of the good spirits, who are armed for fighting in the manner known to the earliest antiquity.

“When the evil-minded malefactor hastens hither with speedy steps, then Mithra, the lord over wide fields, yokes his bright chariot; and Srausha and Ashi, the bold, and Naryōsangha, the miraculously powerful, swing vigorously their dangerous clubs.”⁴

Clubs were used both for throwing and for striking. The missile club was particularly the weapon of Srausha⁵. It was fastened to the girdle,⁶ as was also the custom of the most ancient warriors of the North.⁷

The missile clubs were often angular, and therefore proved very effective. They were also mounted with studs and tipped with brass. Perhaps they were cast in solid metal. At least so it is said of the Club of Mithra, which, of course with the usual exaggeration as to numbers, is described by the Avesta in the following manner:

¹ *Ayō-khaodha*, Yt. XIII. 45; *Zaranyō-khaodha*, Yt. XV. 57; comp. *supra*. p. 253.

² *Spāra-dāshtra*, Yt. XIII. 35; XIX. 54 (Mod. Pers. *sipar*, “*scutum*”).

³ The club already occurs in the Gāthās as *vadare* (Skr. *vadhar*), Ys. XXXII. 10. Also the weapon with which Hauma dashes down the evil-doer is called *vadhare* (Ys. IX. 30 *seq.*)

⁴ Yt. X. 52. Here the club is denoted by *vādha*, akin to *vadhare*, from rt. *vādh*, “to strike, to kill.”

⁵ *Vazra*=Skr. *vajra*, is described in Yt. X. 96 and 132 as a *zaena*, “a missile” (from rt. *zi*=Skr. *hi*; comp. *heti*, “a javelin.”) Even by *zaena* in Yt. X. 141 is to be understood the club. The word, which usually denotes the handling of the *vazra*, is *ni-vij*, “to swing down, to dash down.” Cf. the epithet *huvivikhta*.

⁶ Hence Vd. XVIII. 30 speaks of the laying down of the *vazra*, *apa-yuj*, “to unfasten”

⁷ Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben* p. 202. According to Arnold, (“German Antiquity,” p. 274), clubs for smiting and for throwing were also used by the ancient Germans.

"He holds fast with the hand his club, the hundred-knobbed, the hundred-edged, the down-crushing one, annihilating men, which is cast in light-coloured brass, strong, gold-coloured (brass); the most powerful of all weapons, the most victorious of all weapons."¹

The club especially employed for striking was also shod with brass². It is referred to as the weapon of Mithra, who crushes with it his enemy, man and horse at once. Similarly, Kersāspa, a hero of Irānian antiquity, is styled the club-bearer³.

The *Chakusha*⁴ must have been a weapon of a similar kind to the club. It is described as made of copper and double-pointed. Consequently, it was a pole-axe of metal, either end of which could be equally used. It is said of the Fravashis that they cause the Chakusha to reach the object at which it is thrown.

One of the most primitive weapons was the *sling*. Hence we find it in use amongst the most diverse, if not amongst all, nations inhabiting the globe.⁵ If handled with dexterity, it is in no way to be despised. In old Irān, its form must have been almost the same as among other nations.

The usual number of sling stones⁶, which the Irānians were accustomed to carry with them, was thirty. While the force of an arrow depended upon the elasticity of the bow-string, strength of arm was essential to the effective use of the sling⁷.

Like the sling the *bow* was used for fighting at a distance, but was probably regarded as superior in effect to the former.⁸

It was formed of a curved piece of elastic wood, the two ends of which were fastened by means of a string made of the sinews of cattle.⁹ When the bow was not used, the string was loosened in order not to deprive the wood of its flexibility. The tightening of the bow-string-before the commencement of a battle is compared to the harnessing of the horse to the chariot.¹⁰

¹ Yt. X. 96 and 132.

² *Gadha*, Yt. X. 101; used with the epithet *ayāghaṇa*, Yt. X. 131. The verb used with it is *nī-jan*, "to dash down."

³ *Gadhavara*, Ys. IX. 10; Yt. XIII. 61. *gadha* (masc.) means "robber, murderer," then, apparently, "club-bearer."

⁴ *Chakusha* (*haosafuæni-bitaḡgha*, Yt. X. 130, *taḡgha*, "point"; *dāra*, "corner, edge") or *chakush*. *Aku* and *chaku* are similar weapons.

⁵ Tylor, *Anfänge der Cultur*, I. pp. 66, 74.

⁶ *Asna* or *zarshiva* . *fradakhshanya* (from *fradakhshana*, "sling"). Yt. X. 39.

⁷ Hence *fradakhshana* . *snāvare-bāzura* . *mat* . *thrisās* . *fradakhshanyāish*, "a sling, that has the arm for the string, with 30 sling-stones," Vd. XIV. 9 (cf. Vd. XVII. 9-10). *Asānō* . *aremōshuta*, "sling-stones thrown by means of the arm," Yt. XIII. 72.

⁸ *Thanvan*, *thanvare*, "bow," certainly, = Skr. *dhanvan*; *jya* and *snāvare*, "string."

⁹ Hence *gavasnahē* . *snāvya* . *jya*, Yt. X. 128.

¹⁰ *Thaūj*, "to harness" (in the epithets *thakhta* and *hvathakhta*) is said of the bow just as it is usually of the horse elsewhere.

The Fravashis are armed with bows and kill the demons with their missiles. This weapon bears in the Avesta the expressive name of "battle victor," which proves that it was in high favour with the Irānians.¹

As regards the *arrow*,² the different parts of it are to be distinguished. The shaft consisted, I believe, of a reed or a thin twig. The lower end at which the arrow rested on the string was called the "foot," and was generally made of horn.³ The arrow-head was made of brass, and was similarly called the "mouth," since it drank the enemy's blood.⁴ Below the point were fixed barbs of brass "sprouts," which were intended to render more difficult the extraction of the arrow from the wound.⁵

The shaft was adorned with feathers, which likewise increased the velocity of the arrow. The same practice is found among the old Indians⁶ who preferred the feathers of vultures and falcons for the purpose of ornamenting the arrow.⁷

The number of arrows which they were wont to carry with them was the same as the number of sling-stones, and they were placed in a *quiver*.⁸

Erkhsa is regarded in the Avesta as one of the most powerful archers. According to tradition, he is said to have shot with his arrow from the Khshautha mountain to the Qanvat mountain.⁹

Mithra is likewise armed with a bow, since he sends forth rays or darts of the sun.

The arrow is the symbol of swiftness. Hence it is said of the horses which drew the chariot of Srausha, that they were swifter than the rain-clouds, swifter than a well darted arrow.¹⁰

In the Vedic antiquity the bow is esteemed as the noblest of weapons. "It helps towards dominion and glory, and remains even in the hand of the dead until the last moment before burial."¹¹

¹ Yt. XIII. 45. *Arezazhi* from *āreza*, "fight," and *ji*, "to conquer."

² "Arrow," *ishu* (=Skr. *ishu*), *asti* (from root *agh*, "to throw," from which is derived *āghu*, Yt. XIII. 46), *tighri* ("the point"; cf. Skr. *tigma*, Old Irānian *stij*, "point of a weapon," Yt. X. 71), *mana*, Ys. LVII. 28.

³ *Srvi-slayanām* (Yt. X. 129) is an epithet applied to *ishunām*. *Srvi* comes from *sru*, "horn," and *staya* I derive from *stā*, "to stand," thus "possessing a horny foot."

⁴ *Ayō-aghra*, "with brazen point," Vd. XIV. 9. Comp. *yāsyā āyo mūkham*, "the mouth of which is brass," Rig-veda, 7, 75, 15. *Zaranyō-zafra*, "with brazen mouth" (Yt. X. 129), poetically said of the arrow of Mithra.

⁵ *Ayāḡ ha na . sparegha*, Yt. X. 129.

⁶ Zimmer, *AI.L.* p. 300.

⁷ Hence the epithets *kahrkāsō-parena* and *erezīfō-parena*. Cf. *Ostirānische Kultur* pp. 163-164.

⁸ Vd. XIV. 9 *zanī* or *akana* may mean a "quiver."

⁹ Yt. VIII. 6 and 37. Comp. *supra* pp. 110-111.

¹⁰ Ys. LVII. 28, cf. *supra* p. 228.

¹¹ Zimmer, *AI.L.* p. 298.

"The bow allows us to conquer cattle,
With it we stand victorious in hot battles ;
The bow creates discomfort to the enemy,
With it we conquer all the lands ! " ¹

With the Avesta people it is rather the *spear* which plays so important a part. In the enumeration of weapons it is named first, then follows the sword, then the club, and then only the bow with quiver and arrows ; lastly, the sling and the sling-stones.²

The weapons effective in close combat likewise precede those suitable for distant fighting. With the old Indians the case was the reverse. The reason of this probably lies in the fact that the old Irānian warriors particularly practised close fighting in their more uneven territory. The Vedic Arians on the plains of the Panjāb must, on the contrary, have exercised themselves principally in wielding the bow.

The spear-head appears to have been edged. Consequently, the spear³ receives the epithets "well sharpened," "pointed," "sharp as an axe."⁴ Its length also is referred to as worthy of note. "With a long and pointed spear" is an epithet applied to Mithra as the bold champion in all battles ; it is likewise used of warriors generally.⁵

The spear was thrown. Whether the lance for thrusting was also known cannot be determined. I believe the charioteers first shot from a distance with their arrows, then they hurled their javelins, and lastly, when it came to close fighting, they, like the Homeric heroes, drew their swords.

"Away flies the spear, which an opponent of Mithra hurls, on account of the many vicious sayings which a Mithra-deceiver utters."⁶

"The pointed spears of the Mithra-deceivers, the well-sharpened, long-shafted ones, which fly from the arms, (and) do not hit the mark, when, irritated and embittered and raging, approaches Mithra, the lord over wide fields."⁷

¹ Rig.-veda, 6, 75, 2.

² Vd. XIV. 9.

³ The spear is called *arshti* = Skr. *shti*. Often *arshti* is specially used for the shaft, wherefore the spear itself may be called *daregha-arshti*. Also *dru* in *darshi-dru* and *khrevi-dru* — "with frightful and bloody spear" — is a designation of the spear, just as *dāuru* (= Skr. *dāru*, "wood") and *sūra* (= Skr. *çūla*.)

⁴ *Hukhsnūta*, *tighra*, Yt. X. 39 ; *barōithrō-ta:zha*, Yt. X. 130 (*barōithra* from rt. *bar* = Mod. Pers. *buridan*, "to cut.")

⁵ Yt. X. 102 ; XVII. 12.

⁶ Yt. X. 20.

⁷ Yt. X. 39. Comp. Yt. X. 139, wherein it is said that the spears of Mithra, obeying the heavenly will, fly towards the head of the demons.

The *sword* of the old Irānian seems to have been a short weapon of handsome form like a cutlass. This we may infer from the same word being also a designation of the surgical knife of the physician.¹ It was made of brass and was double-edged,² fastened to the girdle and borne either naked or in a scabbard. It was drawn when one had to fight at close quarters.³

The hilt of the sword was ornamented with golden aglets; its blade was engraved, as it seems, with marks and figures. Such a richly-decorated sword is worn by Verthraghna, the *yazata* presiding over victory.⁴

Lastly, I further mention the *dagger*. Riders made use of it to goad on their steeds; nevertheless it is also found employed in fighting.⁵

Yima carries a gold-adorned dagger as a token of his sovereign power;⁶ likewise, Mithra bears this weapon;⁷ and, lastly, the heroes with rattling chariots and snorting steeds are also styled "daggers-swinging."⁸

§ 3. Legal Rights.

In treating of the legal usages of the Avesta people we meet with considerable difficulty. The sources which are at our disposal are all derived from the priesthood. All legal ideas and the institutions which they record represent essentially the views of the sacerdotal class.⁹

¹ *Kareta*, "sword, knife"; comp. Skr. *kṛitī*, Rv. I. 168. 3, a weapon of the Marut.

² *Ayağha:na*, Vd. IV. 50 (in Ys. XXXII. 7 *ayağh* is used just as the German "*Stahl*" for the "murderous weapon"); *wayō-dāra*, Yt. X. 131.

³ *Hufrayukhta*, "well-girded," Yt. X. 40; *hufrāgharshita*, "well-drawn," Yt. XIII. 72. Comp. Skr. *pra-srj*.

⁴ Yt. XIV. 27.

⁵ Yt. X. 113.

⁶ *Ashtrām . zaranyō-paesim*, Vd. II. 7.

⁷ *Ashtrağhādih*, Yt. X. 112.

⁸ Yt. V. 130; XVII. 7: *khshva:wayat-ashtra*.

⁹ [Comp. Prof. M. Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*; Abbott's ed. vol. V. p. 201: "The rules concerning purity and purification, the expiations and penances necessary to avert the evil, which we possess in the Vendidad of the Avesta, are only the remnant of a far more comprehensive law. From the list of books and chapters traditional among the Parsees, we can see that it was intended to include not only all the invocations and prayers which the worship required, the rules of sacrifice and the entire ritual, together with the calendar of the ecclesiastical year, but also of the arrangement of the process of law, the civil and criminal code, and, moreover, rules for agriculture and medicine. If to this we add the statements and quotations of the Greeks, we may assume that the scriptures of Eastern Irān comprised the whole knowledge of the (ancient) priesthood. In the Avesta the Athravas had sketched the ideal picture of the correct conduct pleasing to Ahura Mazda in every department of life. How far the princes of Bactria and the viceroys of Cyaxares and the Achæmenids, or even these princes themselves, and the judges, wished or allowed themselves to be bound in their decisions by these regulations of the priests, may be left out of the question. The priests here, like the Brahmans in India, could only influence the action of the State and those charged with it, so far as the reverence for the principles for the religion and the force of their own authority extended." *Tr. n.*]

The earliest mode of vindicating one's right was certainly self-redress or revenge.¹ This right of retaliation was first restrained by the tribunal of the commonalty, which was formed, we may be sure, amongst the old Irānians in no less natural a way than amongst the other Indo-Germanic peoples. Most probably it was composed of the fully-authorized members of a village-community, in which the oldest member presided. The latter was the actual judge who pronounced the decision.²

This tribunal had principally to decide upon the quarrels inevitable in civil life and which concerned the *meum et tuum*, disputes respecting boundaries, injuries to reputation and the like. Hence we may conclude that they can play no considerable part in the Vendidād.

If the Vendidād were a civil code, these very trials must occupy a large space. But in my opinion it is not so. For here we only meet with those causes wherein the priesthood reserved jurisdiction to themselves or added an ecclesiastical punishment to that of the secular judge. In such petty causes as those first referred to, the priests evidently renounced their right of jurisdiction, which would otherwise have imposed upon them a great burden without materially adding to their authority and influence.

Self-redress was, no doubt, mostly resorted to in cases of bodily hurt or murder. Blood demanded blood in return. If a free man had been slain by another, it was considered a right—nay, in the oldest times, a duty—to slay the murderer and so to expiate the crime.

I believe that the custom of blood-feuds existed amongst the Eastern Irānians. Yet we must suppose that the Zoroastrian religion sought to restrain it, although it may never have succeeded in completely abolishing this system of revenge. Doubtless it continued to exist in full force against the non-Zoroastrians.

The incessant wars waged by the Irānians against the Tūrānians originated, according to the legend, in fulfilling this duty of revenging bloodshed. *Syāvarshan*, the son of Kavi Usan, was slain by the Tūrānians. His grandson, Kavi Husrava, takes the field against Frangrasyan to revenge the outrage.

The origin of this legend can undoubtedly be traced to the Avesta. Here the genius Hauma, who aids the good cause, addresses to Druvāspa the following prayer—

¹ *Kaṇa*=Mod. Pers. *kin* and *kinah*.

² *Vichira* (Ys. XXIX. 4, and Ys. XLVI. 5) seems to be a name for the judge. The latter passage, which is very difficult to explain, apparently alludes to such a tribunal of the commonalty. Terms referring to right and law are not at all wanting, and they even directly prove the existence of a well-organized system. "Right," I believe, is designated by *tkasha* or *dāta*. *Urvākhshaya* in Ys. IX. 10 is distinctly called a "judge" (*tkashō . dātō-rāzō*). Evidently he was greatly renowned for his decisions. We may easily conceive that "right" was regarded as a creation and gift of Ahura and Zarathushtra (Vsp. II. 11 Ys. XVI. 2, etc.).

“Grant me that I may fetter the pernicious Tūrānian *Frangasyan* and that I may bring him bound and in fetters to Kavi Husrava ; that *Kavi Husrava* may kill him behind the Lake Chaichasta, the deep, broad-waving, (*Kavi Husrava*) the son of the daughter of *Syāvarshan*, of the cruelly slain man and of the *Naruid Aghrairatha*.”¹

Another instance of revenge for bloodshed is mentioned in the Avesta in the family of Kersāspa. The brother of this hero has fallen by the hand of Hitāspa and is to be revenged. Therefore Kersāspa prays :—

“Grant me, O Vayu, that I may revenge the blood of my brother *Urvākhshaya* ; that I may kill *Hitāspa* and drag him behind my chariot.”²

The first check upon the right of retaliation is effected by enabling the murderer to secure immunity by means of an adequate compensation in money. This peaceable compensation can be much more easily effected in cases of mere bodily injury than in those of actual murder. Such a compensation in money is called *weregild*.³ At first, I believe, the injured person was free to accept the *weregild* or to demand blood for blood.

Wherever the State begins to cultivate the administration of justice and endeavours to restrain the freedom of self-redress, it will start with the institution of a *weregild*. Under certain circumstances the injured person is compelled to accept this money ; under others he must abide by the verdict of the common-council ; or, again, under others he is left to his choice.

So it was with the Avesta people. The *weregild* was well known to them. The *Vendidād* inculcates to the followers of Zoroastrianism not to refuse the *weregild* if offered in expiation of some deed of bloodshed.

Amongst the Avesta nation the regular *weregild* was paid chiefly in cattle and other kinds of moveable property. In most serious cases even women and maidens were offered, who were, I believe, married to the new possessors.

It is characteristic that the *Vendidād* mentions a “spiritual” mode of compensation, which probably consisted in some ecclesiastical atonement.⁴

¹ Yt. IX. 18 ; XVII. 37. Cf. Yt. IX. 22 ; XVII. 42.

² Yt. XV. 28.

³ [In old English law *weregild* was the price or compensation paid by the murderer to the king for a man killed, partly to the lord of the vassal, and partly to the next-of-kin. Vide Webster, *Tr. n.*]

⁴ The passage of the *Vendidād* (IV. 44) referring to the *weregild* comes immediately after the passage treating of bodily hurt. It runs thus : “If people come, fellow-believers, relatives, or friends to expiate (*shaztō-chinaǵhō*, cf. *supra*, p. 259, note 2) by money, or with (*giving in marriage*) a woman (*nāiri-chinaǵhō*), or in the spiritual way (*khratu-chinaǵhō*)—if they will expiate by money they shall bring up the money ; if by a woman they shall give in marriage a young maiden (to the person offended) ; if in the spiritual way, they shall recite the Holy Word.” Etymologically *chinaǵh* is of course connected with *chitha*, “expiation, punishment.”

- With the Afghāns blood-feuds and the weregild continue to the present day.

Families and houses are constantly engaged in quarrels and feuds. Family dissensions, provoked by deeds of bloodshed, fill up the whole life of an Afghān with hatred, enmity, and assassination. Legally this old custom of revenge for bloodshed is indeed prohibited; but secretly and under the cover of dissimulation hatred continually smoulders, to blaze forth on the first opportunity. The number of persons killed on both the sides is exactly known. Every one knows how many of the opposite party still must die to fill up the measure of vengeance. Until this is done, there is no rest or quiet.

Thus it happens that the blood-feud often continues through several generations, exacts numerous victims, and ruins the happiness and peace of all families. . . .

We have now to treat of those features of the Law, which are enumerated in the Vendidād as subject to the competence of the priesthood. Transgressions against the ritual and ceremonial are the most frequent. Here it is likewise the special right and duty of the clergy to inflict punishment and to maintain their authority.

Punishments are prescribed for the non-exposure of dead bodies or for burying them. It is also regarded as a punishable act to throw a carcass on the ground; likewise to leave a corpse on the *dakhma* insecurely fastened, so that wild beasts carry away pieces of it. It is also punishable if one spreads new clothes over a dead body, or cultivates a piece of ground before it has been purified in the manner prescribed in the Avesta.

To these must be added transgressions against morality, particularly sexual intercourse with menstruating women, which are punished on the same principle. In short, wherever the Vendidād lays down a ritual precept, it also at the same time adds the punishment which shall be inflicted upon the guilty in case of transgression.¹

It is strange, and can only be explained from the peculiar views of the Zoroastrians, that also the ill-feeding and maltreatment of dogs were prosecuted as criminal.² But we must not here forget that the dog was reputed a sacred animal, and was esteemed in the same way as man.

Furthermore, it is characteristic, as regards the legal obligations of the Mazdayasna, that all compacts ought to be scrupulously maintained,³ and

¹ Vd. V. 14 : III. 36 *seq.*; VI 4 *seq.*; V. 43 ; VIII. 26 *seq.*; XVIII. 67 etc. The stereotyped expression is *yezi nōit . . . kâ hē asti chitha* "if (it is) not (done), what is the punishment for it?"

² Vd. XIII. 12 *seq.*, 20 *seq.*, XV. 50-51. Cf. *supra* p. 241.

³ *Mithra*, "contract, agreement"; *urvaiti*, "mutual promise." See *supra* p. 220. The relation between employer and workman is considered to be a contract, Vd. III. 35 (*ZdämG.* vol. XXXIV. p. 425).

their violation strictly punished. Even towards unbelievers the Mazdayasna was obliged to respect every agreement.¹

There were different kinds of agreement, varying according to the manner in which they were concluded, and according to the value of the object given in pledge.

“The first (*kind of*) agreement is that made by the given word; the second is made by a pledge with the hand (*i. e.*, by a hand-stroke); the third has the value of a head of small cattle (*i.e.*, a head of small cattle was given as security), the fourth has the value of a head of large cattle; the fifth has the value of a man; the sixth has the value of a piece of ground.”²

Evidently any agreement whatever could be ranged under one of these six categories, according as it was to be made more or less binding. The mere word, or the giving of the hand, was sufficient to give legal value to an agreement. But to gain greater security, a pledge of more or less value was often demanded; or it was even freely offered to enhance one's obligation.

When the agreement was not kept, the pledge was forfeited. This might include, as we have seen, even persons. Probably the person himself who made the bargain, or one of his near relations, stood bail or surety. If the engagement was not fulfilled the surety lost his liberty, and his life and property were forfeited to the opposite party. If I am not mistaken, in case of a broken agreement, the relations of a debtor in general might be called to account, so that they were obliged to answer for the payment of the amount of compensation.³

¹ In Yt. X. 2, it is expressly stated: “The compact is binding on both (*i.e.* the opposite parties), on the pious as well as on the wicked ones.”

² Vd. IV. 2. Here *danhū* of course does not denote “country” in its political sense but simply “land, landed property, real estate.” It is impossible that *pasu*, *staora*, etc., can in this passage signify the object of the contract. In this case the two first kinds would not agree with the following, since with these no object is generally named. That this view of mine is correct, is proved by what follows in the text which evidently contains a more detailed description of the different kinds of contract: “The given word confirms the first kind of contract; something that has the value of a handstroke (*or the offering of the hand as pledge of a solemn promise*) effects the second kind, *i.e.*, something that has the value of a handstroke must be offered as a pledge of the agreement. Something that has the value of a sheep makes the third kind of contract, *i.e.*, something that has the value of a sheep must be offered as a pledge in making the agreement. Something that has the price of an ox or cow effects the fourth kind, *i.e.*, something of the value of a head of cattle must be offered as a pledge of the agreement. Something that has the value of a man concludes the fifth kind of contract, *i.e.*, something must be offered that has the worth of a man. Something that is worth a field confirms the sixth kind of contract, *i.e.*, something of the price of a field must be offered (as a pledge) in concluding the agreement.” *Fra-marez* (Vd. IV. 3-4) must be the expression denoting the making of a contract. This is proved by the compound *zastō marštā*, “confirmed by the handstroke.” It is surprising that of the second kind it is not simply said as of the first *zastō . bitīm . mithrem kerenaoiti*; but that here a pledge is mentioned.

³ This, at least, seems to be the meaning of the passage Vd. IV. 5-10, although I do not fully understand the connection of this passage with the following.

Finally, I mention cases of bodily injury which, as the Vendidād says, were punished according to the complete or at least partial competence of the priesthood.

Even a simple attack upon a person was regarded as culpable; every repetition of the offence considerably enhanced the guilt. Corporal injuries were punished according to the consequences caused to the injured person.

The Vendidād, therefore, distinguishes the following transgressions:—

If a man stretches out the hand to give a blow to another it is an *Āgerpta*, an “attack.” If one lays hands on another it is an *Avaurishta*, a “surprise.”

By these two transgressions the Vendidād seems to understand such as were committed without any evil premeditation, perhaps provoked by anger and passion. For it says further on: “If a man attacks any person with a malicious intention it is an *Ardush*. By the fifth of the *ardush-sins* the body is forfeited.”¹

I do not think any peculiar kind of wounding is signified by *Ardush*. Bodily hurt is even spoken of more widely and under the threat of greater punishments. Firstly, the Vendidād speaks of the wound which bleeds but a little; secondly, the wound from which the blood flows; then the stroke by which a bone is broken; finally, any injury which causes insensibility.²

Let us now examine the kinds of punishment prescribed by the Vendidād for these different crimes. They prove clearly that the Vendidād is, indeed, only a legal code instituted by the priesthood and entirely independent of secular judgments and tribunals.

Capital punishment is not unheard of. Yet it is characteristic enough that the Vendidād does not assign it to murder or manslaughter. It is instead awarded to any one who exercises priestly functions without being competent and without having the necessary knowledge³

But, finally, the form of punishment by far most common in the Vendidād is that by means of *upāzana*, which word is regularly translated by “stripe or stroke,” more correctly by “bringing in or delivery.”⁴

¹ Vd. IV. 7. *Āgerpta* is derived from *ā* and *garw*; *avaurishta* perhaps from *ava* and *urvis* (cf. Sk. *vraçch*, “to hew, to split”); *ardush* certainly comes from the root *ared* = Skr. *rd.*, “to torment, to hurt, to violate.”

² *Vikhrūnentem . garem, tachat-vōhunim . astō-bidhem . garem. frazā-baodhaghēm . snathem.* Vd. IV. 30, 34, 37, 40. The last expression is translated by Dr. Justi: “depriving of one’s life.” This seems to be incorrect. *Baodhaghēm* must be translated “sensibility consciousness.” If murder were meant, it is certain that a far more severe punishment must have been fixed, particularly in relation to the trespasses immediately preceding.

³ Vd. IX. 47, 49. Also Vd. IV. 50, alludes to capital punishment, specially to decapitation by the sword. The words are: *Ayagha:nūish . karetūish . azlēbish . paiti . ava-kerethyāt.* The intrinsic connection of the passage is quite obscure.

⁴ *Upāzana* is derived from *upa* and *az* = Sanskrit *apa-aj*, “to drive by.” Tradition has erroneously conceived the meaning of this word, for it traces it to Phlv. *zanishn*, “stroke.” [Cf. Spiegel *E.A.* vol. III. p. 696. “Eine der gewöhnlichsten Bassen scheint des Tödtens einer Anzahl schädlicher Thiere gewesen zu sein, darauf scheinen sich die Zutreibungen nach der Uebersetzung Schläge) zu heziehen, von welchen im Vendidād so oft die Rede ist.” *Tr. n.*]

I have often put to myself the question whether by *upāzanas* are to be understood stripes that are inflicted on the culprit.

I am now of opinion that this is impossible ; nay, that this supposition contradicts common sense.

The very instrument that must serve for giving strokes, the goad that was used to drive horses, is not quite adapted for this purpose. The whip that is mentioned afterwards would be more appropriate.¹

Still more striking are the numbers given in the Vendidād. Two hundred strokes with the goad and two hundred stripes with the whip are indeed very common. They are inflicted for bringing fire into an impure dwelling. Whoever cultivates a piece of ground polluted by anything dead before a year has passed, shall also be liable to the same penalty : nay, even a woman shall be similarly punished who drinks water immediately after her delivery.² Whoever flings a bone into a field, must receive twice six hundred stripes.

This is simple brutality to which no man on the whole earth, not even the most abject and ignorant, would submit.³ I doubt also very much if any man could have physical strength to bear twelve hundred strokes of goad and whip ; and certainly neither extraneous nor native testimony exhibits the Irānian priests as barbarians and tyrants. Yet they would have been so, if they had employed this cruel form of bodily chastisement.

I also believe that a hierarchy that used such means would soon have been overthrown. A single execution of this kind, or two, would have sufficed to incite the whole people to discontent and revolt.

The *upāzana* even amount to two thousand. This number of stripes is to be inflicted on any one who inters dead dogs or men in the earth and does not disinter them within a year,⁴ a transgression which is undoubtedly regarded from a Zoroastrian stand-point as a very heavy crime. The same punishment is prescribed for spreading a *new* garment over a dead body, as well as for sprinkling water over the corpse of a man or dog.⁵

This would be so irrational, so ridiculous, a mode of punishment, that even opponents of the Zoroastrian system must allow that there cannot be any question here of actual blows. But if we are forced to make this concession, is it not much more reasonable to say that *upāzana* must not be translated by "stroke or stripe" ?

¹ *Aspahē.ashtra, sraoshō-charana*. M. Darmesteter (Vend. Introduction, V. § 19) indeed, conjectures that both the Avesta words designate the same instrument ; but this opinion is contradicted by the words of the text, which always run thus :—

*Upāzana . upāzōit . aspaḥē . ashtraya, * sraoshō-charanuya.*

² Vd. V. 44 ; VI. 5 ; VII. 72.

³ [In the absence of any indigenous definition of the word, indeed, it is impossible at the present stage of Irānian research to give a positive description of the kind of instrument called the *upāzana*, or to found any opinion as regards the legal usages of the Avesta people on the mere ground of individual hypothesis. Tr. n.]

⁴ Vd. III. 37. *ZddmG.* vol. XXXIV. (1880), p. 426, note.

⁵ Vd. VIII. 25 ; VI. 25.

So it will be advisable to adopt the original opinion of Dr. Spiegel concerning the *upāzana*. According to his idea the point in question is not respecting the strokes or stripes inflicted on the culprit, but on the empire of the evil spirits as it were for the sake of compensation. The question is regarding the destruction of certain obnoxious and impure animals and the delivery of the animals killed to the priest. This conception is best expressed by the term "delivery."

Herodotus relates that the Magi destroy ants, serpents and other creeping and flying animals. The same is said by Agathias of the Persians generally ; and he also remarks that they bring the animals when killed to their priests.¹

The "goad" is evidently a pointed instrument with which serpents, toads and similar vermin were destroyed. The whip, as Dr. Spiegel supposes, was perhaps a kind of fly-flap. The two instruments, as the Vendidād seems to indicate, were really made use of for killing similar animals.²

I repeat here that the Vendidād is by no means a civil code. It contains only the discipline practised by the priesthood. Hence it is self-evident why direct transgressions against religious precepts are punished most severely. If the expiation consisted only in the delivery of *khrafstras* slain, it might also amount to large sums of money. And it may be assumed that people must, at an early period, have relieved themselves from their obligations by the payment of money instead of the prescribed penalty. The scourge could never have been used to such an extent without provoking opposition.

Trespasses against public order and security were tried before the secular tribunal. Respecting such cases, too, does the Vendidād prescribe atonements in some places. These were evidently additional to the punishments decreed by the secular judge, and the priesthood thereby made the people understand that they also partook in the vindication of the law.

But this circumstance will explain, why comparatively milder punishments are laid down in the Vendidād for those very transgressions. Twice five *upāzana* are set down for an *āgerpla*, twice ten for an *avvurishla*, and twice fifteen for an *ardush*. Furthermore, mutilations of the body are punished with twice thirty, fifty, seventy, ninety *upāzana*. On the contrary, for a contamination, which is merely accidental and by no means culpable, no less than twice four hundred *upāzana* are prescribed.³ This, I think, shows evidently that the *upāzana* do not in general bear properly the character

1 Herodotus, I. 140 ; Agathias, II. 24. Cf. Spiegel, *Commn.* vol. I. pp. 109 *seq.*

2 *Khrafstraghuem* . *sraoshō-charanaya*, Vd. XIV. 8 ; *ashtrām mairim*, Vd. XVIII, 4.

3 Thus Vd. VIII. 104. Here the question refers to man who has come in contact with a corpse in the desert. The precept is that he must go immediately to the nearest village or hamlet, in order to be purified. If on his way he passes by water or plants, these are sullied by him. This sin must be expiated by an adequate and rather considerable number of *upāzana*.

of a punishment. They are rather a kind of expiation, whereby every triumph gained by the empire of evil shall be compensated by an equivalent invasion and defeat of the same.

The breaking of an engagement is, according to the Avesta, a crime against Mithra, *i.e.* against God and religion. Here, therefore, we meet again with very high numbers of *upāzana*. They begin from twice three hundred *upāzana*, and rise to twice a thousand. The former are prescribed for breaking one's word, the latter for breaking a contract of the sixth and highest kind.

It is to be observed that, from breaking a given word to breaking a pledge given by the hand, the expiation abruptly rises from twice three hundred to twice six hundred *upāzana*. After this it rises for each distinct kind of breach of contract by one hundred *upāzana* only.

Sometimes it may have happened that the perpetrator of some crime could not be found out with certainty. To clear up doubts the ordeal was resorted to. People believed that God himself would decide in a supernatural way, and would bring to light guilt and innocence.

The ordeal was an institution common to all Indo-Germanic peoples.

The Indians principally made use of the ordeal by fire, which consisted in taking an oath while holding in the hand some burning object, probably a red-hot hatchet. Besides this, a series of other ordeals was known, in which those by water and poison were considered the most formidable.¹

Among the ancient Germans, too, some causes were occasionally decided by means of ordeals. It was quite in keeping with their warlike spirit that a duel between the two contending parties, or trial by combat, was preferred as an ordeal.²

Firdūsī doubtless supposes the ordeal to have been customary with the Persian people from time immemorial. I only mention the account of Siyāvush, who cleared himself from the ignominious calumnies of Sudābe by the ordeal by fire.

He rode on horseback between the huge burning piles of wood and issued from the flames safe and sound amidst the loud acclamations of the people. His innocence was thus thought to have been proved.³

The Vendidad alludes to an ordeal performed with boiling water.⁴ Yet the context is altogether obscure. Whoever appealed to such an ordeal in a frivolous manner, was, it seems, punished with twice seven hundred *upāzana*.⁵

¹ Zimmer, *AiL.* pp. 183-184.

² Arnold, "German Antiquity," p. 341.

³ Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. I. pp. 597-598.

⁴ *Hām-tūptibjō . aiwyō . chākhrare . neregjō, Zarathushtra, (Vd. IV. 46). C. Vd. IV. 54 āpem . saokentavaitīm . zaranyāvaitīm . vithushavaitīm.*

⁵ Vd. IV. 55.

We must doubtless conclude from the Gāthās, that in doubtful cases the will and judgment of the Deity was understood from the flames of the (*sacred*) fire —

“The sentence which Thou, O Spirit, gavest through Fire in a holy manner to the two litigant parties,

The doctrine to the attentive : These announce unto us, O Mazda, that we may know it

With the tongue of Thy mouth, that I may convert thereby all living men to (*Thy*) faith.”¹

It seems that some apostle of the Zoroastrian doctrine here appeals to a fire oracle in order to prove his divine mission. How this was done, we do not know. “The bursting of flames, the rising spark, the crackling of fuel and the shapes taken by smoke, are but a symbolical language, at least as easy to understand as the rustling of the oak at Dodona, or the feeding of chickens, or the appearance of the intestines of animals.”²

An actual ordeal by means of fire and molten metal is meant in the following passage—

“The sentence which Thou gavest to the two litigant parties by Thy red fire, O Mazda,

And by molten metal, to set a mark among living beings,

To hurt the demons, but to give help to the just one : ”³

Finally, I shall quote a strophe containing, in my opinion, a prayer spoken before the beginning of the ordeal. The accused person who undergoes it, apparently invokes the Deity to evince the truth by some token —

“I will conceive Thee as the strong and the blissful, Mazda,

That by Thy hand, with which thou bestowest help,

Since Thou gavest judgment on the wicked and the just

By the glow of Thy strong fire, in holiness,

May the victory of the pious mind fall to my lot.”⁴

¹ Ys. XXXI. 3 : *Rāna* is certainly not = Skr. *araṇi* as Haug supposes. This is etymologically impossible. That I have correctly translated the word by “combatant, litigant party,” is probably proved from Ys. XLIII. 4, which is quoted below.

² Roth, *Yagna*, XXXI. p. 20.

³ Ys. LI. 9.

⁴ Ys. XLIII. 4. *Ashish* is here used in the same sense and connection as *khshnūtem* in the two other passages ; but in *dra vātē*, *ashūnawachū* it is used as *rānōibyā* in other passages.

CHAPTER VI.

ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONS.

§ 4. *The Priesthood.*

It cannot be denied that the Avesta concedes to the priesthood a position of the highest eminence in the old Irānian commonwealth.¹ Wherever the different professions are named together, the priests stand first in the enumeration. Their calling is reputed the noblest, and they alone formed to some extent a sort of caste distinct from the rest of the community.

We will understand this circumstance more fully if we keep in view the character and tendency of the Avesta. I have no hesitation in regarding it as a work much less national than the Rig-veda. It is rather a code of the priesthood, written in their own interest, and especially representing their own ideas. Thus the Avesta naturally embodies whatever the priests claim for themselves. Similarly, the Brāhmans of the Indian commonwealth declare themselves, in the post-Vedic age, the noblest caste, and the earliest and purest emanation of the soul of the world.

Indian literature is much more copious than the Irānian. In the former we can trace how the caste of the Brāhmans continued to rise above the rest of the people ; how it gained, by degrees, the means of assuming to itself such importance and sanctity.

In the later Avesta we observe the results of an analogous process of development. Here also the priesthood can claim to be reputed and considered the first order in the State. It is evident that it had a certain, although only a moral, preponderance in the commonwealth, and that it was regarded with special veneration by the people. But the different phases and degrees of this gradual development are yet unknown to us.

Besides, we cannot fairly attribute to the priests of the Avesta any inordinate desire for power. They were moderate in their claims. Nowhere

¹ [Comp. Max. Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*. (The History of Antiquity), Abbott's ed. vol. V. pp. 187-189.]

"The priesthood could very well claim precedence of the warriors ; on their prayers and sayings, their knowledge of the customs of sacrifice, depended the favour of the divinities, the power of averting evil spirits, the removal of pollution, salvation in this world and the next. Yet they could not obtain such a position as the Brāhmans held on the Ganges after the reform of the ancient faith and the victory of Brahma over Indra. For in Iran there was no order of Çudras, no vanquished remnant of an old population, which created a sharp line of division even among the orders of the Aryas; and moreover the Brāhmans were the first-born of Brahma, a purer incarnation of the divine nature than any other . . . While the priests of Iran in their lives studied especially purity of body and mind ; and they were pre-eminently "the pure men." Only by their means, at any rate with their assistance, could sacrifice be offered ; from their mouths alone could the correct invocations be uttered to the divine beings and the evil ones be driven away. . . . The priesthood of Iran perpetuated their knowledge and their wisdom in their families." *Tr. n.*]

did they overstep the bounds of their natural dominion, their power over spirits and their observance of religion and of divine worship.

Even in the administration of justice, there were but few departments in which their authority could clash with that of the secular tribunal. Here also they were generally restricted to such cases in which jurisdiction was their natural right. It can hardly be proved that the priesthood as such encroached, either directly or indirectly, upon the government of the State, in which the princes and commonwealth evidently enjoyed full liberty, even after Zoroastrianism had become the acknowledged and dominant religion.

The priest style themselves *Āthravans* or *Atharvans*. This name is intimately connected with the fire-cult.¹ The tending of the sacred fire, therefore, must have been, even at an early period, one of the principal duties of the Avesta priest.

So early as in the remotest Arian antiquity *Atharvan* evidently meant a fire-priest. The word has likewise in Indian literature the same, or at least a similar, signification.

Brihaddiva, a Vedic minstrel, calls himself an *Atharvan*. The Soma priests also, whose duty it is to prepare the sacred drink, are called *Atharvans*. Finally, the fire-god Agni, too, it seems, bears this title. He is himself the priest of men, who bears up to heaven prayers and sacrifices in his blazing flames.²

In several passages of the Rig-veda, too, *Atharvan* appears to be a mythical being.³ He is the Indian Prometheus who brings down the fire of the gods after he has produced it by means of friction in the heavenly regions. So we may recognize in him the prototype of all Indian priests who learned from him their divine ritual and calling.⁴

In the Gāthās the word *Āthravan* does not occur. This is of course strange, since the context certainly offers frequent occasion for naming the Zoroastrian priesthood as such. Evidently, therefore, the word had, in the oldest period, no official and solemn collective appellation.

The conditions described in the Gāthās were completely immature and undeveloped. On the contrary, the hymns launch us into an epoch of mighty, social and religious agitation. The doctrine of Zarathustra was evidently not

¹ *Athravan, Atharvan*. The former name may be connected, I believe, with *ātare* "fire." The *th* is explained by the *r* following. The latter name, on the other hand, must be explained differently. I refer it to Skr. *atharyu*, "flaming," which is in Rv. 7. 1. 1. the epithet of Agni, and also to *athari*, "flame," in *atharyō nā dāntam*, Rv. 4.6.8.

² Rv. 10. 120. 8 ; 9. 11. 2 ; 8. 9. 7.

³ In Rv. 1. 80. 16. *Atharvan* is identified with the Father Manu and with Dadhyach in Rv. 6. 16. 4. he is called the son of Dadhyach. In Rv. 1. 83. 5. it is he who first prepared, by offering sacrifice, the way to the gods. In Rv. 10. 87. 12. *Atharvan*, like Agni, seem to be the Lord of Lightning.

⁴ Rv. 6. 16. 13 ; 10. 12. 5. Cf. Rv. 6. 15. 17.

yet generally acknowledged. It was still struggling for existence. It was just beginning to diffuse itself among the people.

In such times it was quite impossible for the Irānian priests to form themselves into an exclusive, compact, organized body. Before the religion preached by priests had completely taken root in the hearts of the people, before peace and repose had taken the place of national conflict, no priestly order could exist. The elevation of the Brāhmins, too, dates from a period of transition in which the Indian people passed from an epoch of warfare and conquest, into one of comfortable repose and undisturbed tranquility.

In the era represented by the Gāthās, there were, it is true, priests and preachers of the Zoroastrian belief. But they had not yet united together into a guild, separating themselves from the rest of the people. This was only possible at a later period, and then only must the general appellation for the priesthood have been adopted. It was taken from an old and venerable term, which designated in the very earliest times the ministers of the sacred fire.

The priests of the old natural religion, which was opposed to Zoroastrianism, were called *Kavi* and *Usij*.¹ The two names, so detestable and abominable to the Avesta, are found in the Rig-veda as denominations of sacrificing priests and chanters of hymns.

But from this we are not to conclude that it was the Zoroastrian Reform which caused the separation of the Arians into two different tribes and the migration of those tribes which afterwards settled in India. This event was, in my opinion, the result rather of social embarrassments.

It is probable, nay, indeed certain, that, even after their separation, the Irānians continued for a long time to do homage to the old deities under their old priests. The length of this period cannot be ascertained. At its close we hear of the Reform, named after Zarathushtra, by which the Arian gods of light were prescribed as demons and their priests condemned as heterodox.

Besides the *Kavis* and *Usij*, the *Karapans*² are mentioned as hostile priests. This name, being indeed obscure, admits of no connection with old Indian conditions.

¹ *Kavi* and *Usij*=Skr. *kavi* and *uṣij*. Tradition translates *kavi* by "blind." The word comes from *ku*, "to see." Thus it originally designated the "seer." In the Old Irānian dialect this meaning was entirely changed. Cognate with *kavi* is, I believe, *vaēpayā*, *kevinō*, Ys. LI. 12, signifying perhaps "an incestuous (cf. root *vip*) pseudo-priest."

² *Karapan*. The etymology of this word is obscure. Tradition makes it mean "deaf." (Cf. the foregoing note).

In a highly interesting passage we find the *Karapans* standing in the midst of a social revolution :—

“Why, Oh Mazda, are the devils so mighty ?

And, therefore, I ask Thee, who will then fight them ?

In alliance with them the *Usij* and *Karapans* ruin the cattle,

And by which the *Kavis* grew up to power.

Not with justice dost Thou cause their pastures to thrive, fertilising them.”¹

Here they side apparently with a less civilized, half nomadic people, who do not take proper care of their herds and flocks. The follower of Zarathushtra opposes them vigorously. But fortune does not always favour him. With bitter complaints does he address himself to *his* God, Mazda, murmuring that the latter does not withdraw His blessing from the unbelievers to grant it to the pious people.

Very often the false priests and heretics allied themselves with princes and thus, aided by temporal power, they oppressed the new doctrine.² Not in all places was the Zarathushtrian Reform willingly and readily accepted by the nobles and grandees.

The passage in which the *Karapans* appear as the priests of intoxicating beverage is also highly characteristic :—

“When will, O Mazda, the men of wisdom step forth ?

When will they drive away the filth of this intoxication, (*lit. intoxicating drink*)

Of which vice the *Karapans* are proud

And the wicked rulers of countries ? ”³

There can be no doubt that this zealous appeal was directed against the *Soma*-cult, to which, in consequence of its licentiousness, the stern minds of the reformers opposed themselves. But here the popular belief remained victorious. Perhaps some success was achieved in restraining the most offensive excesses connected with *Soma*-worship. But the attempt to extirpate it entirely proved vain. In the later Avesta, *Hauma* maintains his place among the *gazatas*, and the *Mazdayasnian* priests prepare that holy nectar just like the Indian *Brāhmans*.

¹ Ys. XLIV. 20.

² Ys. XLVI. 11. Cf. above pp. 287-288.

³ Ys. XLVIII. 10. Cf. Haug. *Gāthās*, vol. II. p. 241. Too bold, indeed, is the supposition that in Ys. XXXII. 3, the word *shkyomām* (var. *shaomām* and *ashyuomām*) designates *Hauma* with his Indian name *Soma*. [*Schlechten*=lit. “being so bad.”]

The opposition of the old priests was gradually broken. The new doctrine triumphed, while the natural religion of the Arians disappeared. Thus the names of the *Kavis* and *Karapans* gradually lost the vivid signification, which they bear in the Gāthās. They are preserved in the later scriptures only in the customary and stereotyped enumeration of evil beings. There they appear along with the *Yātus*, the *Parikas*, the *Daevas* and the *Ashemaughas*.¹ But I do not believe that any clear and definite idea was formed of them.

I shall now treat of the duties and the dignity of the *Athravans* according to the statements of the later Avesta.

The principal task of the priests was to cultivate their religion. They had regularly to perform divine service and to fulfil certain sacrificial functions. They prepared and consecrated the Hauma-drink and kept the sacred fire. Lastly, they performed, according to fixed precepts, the purificatory ritual on persons who had come in contact with unclean things.²

Herodotus gives us a description of the sacrifices offered by the Persians. With his narrative may be compared what Strabo relates regarding the same subject.³

“They ascend to the highest parts of the mountains and offer sacrifices to Zeus, by whose name they designate the whole sphere of the heavens. Besides, they also offer sacrifices to the sun, moon, fire, water, and winds. But, when they are about to sacrifice, they do not erect altars nor kindle any fire; nor do they use libations, nor have they flute-playing, sacrificial cakes, or rough-ground corn. If anybody wishes to offer sacrifice to any one of the deities, he leads the victim to a clean spot and invokes the deity after having decked his tiara with myrtle twigs. When he has cut the animal into small pieces and boiled the flesh, he strews a bed of tender grass, specially trefoil, and lays all the flesh on it. One of the Magi standing by sings the theogonic hymn; for this, they say, is the accompanying song; and without one of the Magi they are not permitted to offer any sacrifice. After some time he that has offered sacrifice carries away the flesh and disposes of it as he thinks proper.”

¹ Vide Ys. IX. 18; Yt. I. 10, 11; Yt. V. 13, X. 34. A signification similar to that of *Karapan* and *Kavi* may be attached to the quite obscure names *Kaqaredha*, *Kaqreidhi*, *Kayudha*, *Kayzidhi*. By the way, I must mention that *Kavi* has occasionally a very honourable meaning. For it is found in a certain family of Eastern Irān, well-renowned in the legends, as a title constantly added before their proper names. The Avesta mentions, as early as in the Gāthās, *Kavi-Vishvāspa* as a mighty protector of the Mazdian faith. There are mentioned also:—*Kavi Usan* or *Usadhan*, who vanquished the demons and subjugated their countries (Yt. V. 45-47), *Kavi Kavāta*, *Kavi Syāvarshan*, *Kavi Husrava*. In Firdūsi's “Book of Kings” they form the dynasty of the Kayānians, who ascended the throne of Irān after the Peshdādians.

² Compare the passage Vd. XVIII. 1-6 quoted further on.

³ Her I. 131-132; Strabo, pp. 732-733. Cf. Windischmann, *Z. St.* pp. 294 seq. Duncker, *GdA.* vol. IV. pp. 131-132; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. pp. 590-591.

This account of Herodotus evidently bears the stamp of an intimate knowledge of his subject. According to his statement, burnt offerings were not customary ; the sacrifice itself is performed by the priest, who accompanies it with a hymn which is chanted principally to consecrate the victim offered.

It is obvious that whatever Herodotus relates of the Persians and the Magi, cannot be implicitly stated regarding the Eastern Irānians. However, we can easily make out some conformity, which is hardly casual, between the usages of the Persians and those of the Avesta priests, and especially in the most important points.

That the Avesta priests did not burn their victims, is self-evident. Fire was regarded by them as sacred ; it would be sullied by any dead body.

On the other hand, animal sacrifices are frequently mentioned in the Avesta. Haushyangha, Yima, Thraitauna, Kersāspa, Kavi Usan, Kavi Husrava, and other legendary kings and heroes, nay, even the enemies of the Avesta people, Azhi Dahāka, Frangrasyan and the Hunus, bring as offerings to Anāhita, to Rāman, to Vayu and to other *yazatas*, a hundred stallions, thousand head of cattle, and ten thousand sheep.¹ The sacrifice is always accompanied by a prayer to fulfil some special desire. The numbers are evidently exaggerated. But they are intended merely to depict in glowing colours the glory and abundance of the heroic age.

Light-coloured animals were preferred for sacrifice. They were killed quite according to the Persian custom and their flesh boiled.² Frequently a festival repast was prepared.³ Thus the sacrifices of the Avesta people had the character of a consecration rather than of an offering.

A still closer resemblance may be traced. The sacrificial ritual was, as Herodotus relates of the Persians, accompanied with the recitation of the sacred texts. The Avesta very frequently alludes to these solemn recitations, in which Gāthās or holy hymns were preferred.⁴ They are, therefore, joined to the Yasna, which is, on the whole, nothing but a collection of texts to be recited in divine worship.

¹ Yt. V. 21, 25, 29 *seq.*; Yt. IX. 3, 8, 13 *seq.*; Yt. XV. 7, 15, 19 *seq.*; Yt. XVII. 24, 28, 37 *seq.*

² *Pach*, "to cook," is the term used for sacrificing an animal. Yt. VIII. 58 ; XIV. 50 : "The Arian countries shall *cook* unto him (unto Tishtrya or Verthraghna) sheep, bright, fine-coloured, or of any other colour resembling that of the Hauma plant."

³ Festival and sacrificial repast is meant by *myazda* = Skr. *medha*, Mod. Persian, *mayazd* or *myazd* "convivium, epulae" (Vuller's *Lex. sub voce*). *Myazd* has, of course, no connection with *mai*, "wine."

⁴ "To recite" is *dreñj* and *srāvaya*, particularly *fra-srāvaya*. Cf. also Spiegel, *Av. üb.*, vol. II. pp. lxii. *seq.*

Finally, it is stated by Herodotus that the Magi were accustomed to strew the ground with tender grass when making sacrificial offerings. This usage dates from the earliest Arian era. The same was, at least originally, practised by the Avesta priests.¹ The Indian Brāhmins, too, strewed consecrated grass near the altar while the sacrificial fire was blazing on it. The ground thus strewn was meant to serve as a seat to the deities, who were invited to the sacrificial repast. The invocation addressed to the genii to come down and sit on the *Barhis* is, therefore, a stereotyped formula in the Rig-veda.

Gradually this custom became modified among the Irānian priests, who only held in their hands a bunch of twigs while offering sacrifice. We do not know when this change took place, but it must have been at a very early period. Even Strabo narrates that the Magi held a bunch of fine tamarisk twigs while chanting sacrificial hymns.

Furthermore, the statement that libations were unknown to the Persians can hardly be said to contradict the authority of the Avesta. In offering up sacrifices, a sacred beverage, *Zauthra*, was indeed prepared and consecrated. Besides, this consecration forms, no doubt, the central point of the whole solemnity; hence the ministering priest is called *Zautar*.² But the Avesta does not relate that the beverage was distributed and poured out or offered to the *yazatas*.

The sacred beverage is the *Hauma* or the *Parahauma*. It consisted, we know, of the juice of the Hauma plant, which was mixed with milk and often seasoned by adding the extract of another plant called *Hadhūnaipāta*.³

The name Hauma denoted not merely the plant and the beverage prepared from it, but at the same time a *yazata*.⁴

The three significations are so intermingled that it is almost impossible to distinguish them.

¹ Vide Yt. VIII. 58; XIV. 50. Still it is said in the Avesta: *baresma, fra-stūraya* "to spread the grass for the purpose of offering." (Cf. Skr. *barhis* derived from a cognate root). Cf. also Vsp. XI. 2, *stareta*, probably meaning "the grass spread for a sacrificial purpose."

² *Zaotbara, zaotare* = Skr. *hotra, hotr*, from rt. zu. = Skr. *hu*.

³ Cf. O.K.A. pp. 230-231. I think that *gūsh, hudhāo, haurvatāt* and *amaretāt*, which are mentioned in Ys. III. 1, IV. 1, &c., as sacrificial gifts, denote the three principal ingredients of the sacred beverage, viz., milk, the water added to the beverage, and the plant itself.

⁴ [Also Hauma seems to be the name of a renowned warrior in the Avesta period. Ashi Yasht, 37-39: "He (Hauma) begged of her (Ashi) a boon, saying: Grant me this, O great Ashi Vaghvi! that I may bind the Turanian murderer, Frangrasyan, that I may drag him bound, that I may bring him bound, unto King Husravah that King Husravah may kill him, behind the lake Chaechasta, to avenge the murder of his father, Syāvarshāna, and of Aghraerutha." Tr. n.]

Several miraculous powers were ascribed to Hauma. The beverage is health-giving ; it wards off death from man. As it animates pious enthusiasm it is called " source of piety." ¹

The consecration of this beverage in the sacrificial ceremony is accompanied by the recitation of a great many hymns of praise, ² all of which extol the blissful effects of Hauma. He is invoked to give health and strength, protection from enemies, thieves and murderers, and victory in the chariot race. Married women beg of him to grant an easy delivery ; maidans pray for husbands. He protects from venomous serpents and from the allurements of courtezans. Everything good is due to his blessing :

" I ask thee for enthusiasm,
For strength and victory,
For health and remedy,
For thrift and growth ;

I pray that I may walk
Among the people, lord of my wishes,
Conquering the enemies and vanquishing the wicked." ³

A very comprehensive prayer to Hauma runs as follows :—

" This first gift I require of thee,
O Hauma, who keepest away death :
The paradise of the pious,
The all-blissful light ;
This second blessing I entreat of thee,
O Hauma, who keepest away death :
Health for this my body ;

That, alert, strong and contented,
I may walk on earth,
Conquering the enemies, vanquishing the demons ;

That I may walk on earth
Victorious and gaining battles,
Conquering the enemies, vanquishing the demons ;

That, first, the thief and the robber
And the wolf we may perceive ;

That none of them may observe us (before we perceive them) !" ⁴

¹ Cf. the epithets *baeshazya*, *dūraosha* and *ashahē . khāo*.

² Ys. IX. and X.

³ Ys. IX. 17.

⁴ Ys. IX. 19—21. Before each strophe the text regularly repeats the two first lines *a* and *b* of this strophe, but only with a variation in the number.

In passing I may mention that the name *Hauma* corresponds in the Indian language to *Soma*. The Rigveda designates by it, like the Avesta, a plant, a sacred beverage, and a powerful deity presiding over both.

The Vedic *Soma*-worship has already been fully treated by several writers. Likewise, the relations between the Irānian *Hauma*-service and the Indian *Soma*-worship have already been described in detail. The investigation has proved that this worship chiefly dates from the Arian period and has developed its peculiar features among the two individual peoples.¹

A further duty of the priesthood, besides the offering of sacrifices and the consecration of the *Hauma*, was the maintenance of the holy fire.

In the house of every *Mazdayasna* there burned a never-ceasing fire. Its maintenance was regarded as a duty of the *pater-familias*.² It was the central and rallying point of all members of that family.

So, too, a continual fire seems to have been tended on the hearth of every chief of a community and every country prince. It was considered the centre of that community and of that country. It was to these political associations, what the hearth-fire was to the family.³

But there were, no doubt, in the early age of the Avesta different sacred fires instituted in certain places and tended by the priests. A description of these fires is given by Dr. Spiegel, chiefly on the authority of the Bundelesh.⁴

It is certain that the Avesta priests performed their ceremonies before a burning fire. This fire was therefore addressed as present in the initiatory formulas, which invite the *yazatas* to the offerings: "We invite *thee*, O Fire, thou son of Ahura Mazda!"⁵

¹ Windischmann: *Ueber den Somacultus der Arier*, "On the Soma-worship of the Arians" in the "Transactions of the Royal Academy of Science, Bavaria." 1847, pp. 127 seq.; Zimmer, *AltL.* pp. 272 seq.; Ludwig, *Einl.* pp. 376 seq.; Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. I. pp. 432 seq.

² Vide *supra* pp. 158-160. Hence fire, too, bears in the Avesta the epithet *umānō-paiti*. (Cf. Skr. *grhapati*, *viṣpati*, the epithets of Agni).

³ Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. p. 575. This usage is apparently very old. Quite analogous customs may be observed among the Greeks and Romans. All Phratries belonging to the community had at Athens their common hearths in the Prytaneum, the town-hall. But there was also a *κοινὴ ἐστία τῶν Ἀρχαίων* (i.e., a common hearth or family-seat of the Arcadians) as well as a *ἐστία τῆς Μακεδονικῆς βασιλείας* (hearth of the Macedonian kingdom). In Italy, too, every town had its own Vesta (*ἐστία*), for instance Lavinium, Alba Longa (*Albana Vesta*), Rome. It is also known to have been customary for colonists to take with them fire from the central hearth of the metropolis and to kindle with it the sacred fire in their new home.

⁴ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. II. pp. 45-47; cf. *ZddmG.* vol. XXXIII. pp. 496-501, on the Fire Gushasp or Gushnasp.

⁵ Ys. I. 12, *tava . āthrō . Ahurahē . Mazdāo . puthra*; likewise II. 12, III. 14, IV. 17.

Though the *Mazdayasna* had no proper temples, they had evidently consecrated fire-places,¹ where the sacred element was nourished and fostered by the priests.

The ceremonies prescribed for inferior modes of purification could be performed by laymen for themselves. In more important cases, however, such as the "purification of the nine nights," it was obligatory to call in a priest.²

The performance of the purificatory ceremonies seems to have been the chief source of revenue to the *Athravans*. Any exorbitant demand was here as impossible as in the case of medical treatment, which was, likewise, rendered by the priests.³

The Vendidad regulates the payment very accurately. It is greater or smaller according to rank and fortune. Only in the case of one priest having purified another was no payment received.

"A priest," says the Avesta,⁴ "shall be purified for his efficacious blessing; the chief of a country for a good male camel; the chief of a district for a stallion; the chief of a village for a bull; the chief of a family for a calf."

If it is possible, continues the text, the payment shall be made in cattle. Exceptionally only, some other kind of movable property may be given, as for instance food, clothes and trinkets.

Laymen are enjoined to observe accurately this scale of rates. They shall take care that the priest leaves the house of the purified person contented and without any resentment. If he goes away angry, the purified person becomes impure anew and remains so for ever.

His garb itself distinguishes the priest by certain symbols which he must always carry.

He wears a *patidāna*, a mouth-band, with which he keeps his mouth covered during offerings, lest he might sully the sacred fire with his breath or saliva. He wears also the *khrafstraghna* and the *dagger*, two instruments which serve for killing impure animals. Finally, it is customary for the priest to hold a bunch of sacred twigs.⁵

¹ Perhaps *āthra* (see my *Handbuch*, *sub voce*); next *dāityagātu*, Vd. VIII. 81 *seq.*

² Cf. *supra* pp. 164.

³ Cf. *ibid.* pp. 255, 257.

⁴ Vd. IX. 37 *seq.*

⁵ I refer here for comparison to the directions prescribed to the Brāhmanas in the Code of Manu: "Fire he must always consider as sacred. He must not blow it out with his breath nor stamp on it. He must also not warm his feet at it, or place it in a pan under his bed or under his feet. He must not throw anything rotten into the fire. Offal, the remains of food, and water which has been used for a bath or a foot-bath, must be removed far away from the fire. Nor is the Brāhman allowed to throw any refuse into water, or pour any blood or drink into it, still less to spit into it. He must not look at his image reflected in the water, or drink water in the hollow of his hand. The clothes of the Brāhman must be always clean and white, and never worn by anybody else. In his ears the Brāhman must wear very bright gold rings. He must wear a wreath on his head, and carry in the one hand a staff of bamboo, in the other *kuça-grass* and the water-pitcher for his ablutions." Duncker, *GdA.* vol. III. pp. 132, 133 (E. Abbott's edition, vol. IV. p. 173).

But the Avesta expressly states that even these external marks do not make the priest. Many a man feigned to be an Āthravan by assuming these badges unlawfully, probably with a view to profit.

Hence the warning of the Vendidād :—“ Many a man wears the *patidāna* or the *khrafstraghna*, or holds the bunch of sacred twigs, or has the serpent-sting (or *instrument for killing venomous creatures*), without being invested according to the precepts of the religion, and fraudulently says he is an Āthravan.”

“ But do not call such a one an Āthravan, who spends the whole night and more time besides, without offering, without saying prayers, without reciting the holy sayings, without performing ceremonies, without teaching or being taught in order to gain (immortal) existence at the Chinvat-Bridge, and fraudulently says he is an Āthravan. Do not call him an Āthravan. Him rather thou shalt call an Āthravan, who meditates during the whole night and longer, who delivers one from anxiety and gives (*him*) joy at the Chinyat-Bridge, who gives (*him*) religious instruction, who makes (*him*) gain heaven and the piety and the bliss of Paradisc.”¹

Here the aim of the priesthood is evidently to make good their separation from the inferior orders. Every illegal encroachment upon their rights is punished with the greatest severity. Whoever performs the purificatory rites without a sufficient knowledge of the ritual shall, according to the Avesta, be punished with death.²

In the period from which dates the enactment of such regulations, the Āthravans must have formed themselves into an exclusive order, and ascribed to the priesthood a higher dignity than to other professions. Whoever did not belong to their guild, was not allowed to perform any priestly functions. Whoever nevertheless ventured to do so, had to undergo the severest punishment.

The priests do not seem to have had any fixed property in the country. It is expressly stated that they eat whatever food they can manage to obtain, and that they possess little wealth.³ They lived on what they earned by medical practice and by performing purificatory ceremonies.⁴

¹ Vd. XVIII. 1-6 (leaving off a few words, particularly at the beginning). “To meditate”=*Khratūm . pares . ashavanem.*, “to consult the pious mind.”

² Vd. IX. 47, 49. See above, p. 303.

³ Vd. XIII. 45 : *paiti-garetha . qaraiti . . . kasu-draona*.

⁴ [In connection with the daily life of the Iranian priesthood, it would be interesting to quote the following extract from (Dr. West) chapter XLVI of the *Dādistāni-dinik* : “ Is it allowable that those of the priesthood, when there is no daily livelihood for them from the life of the priesthood, should abandon the priesthood, and that other work be done, or not ? The reply is this, that there is no loss of reputation to priests from priestly duties, which are themselves the acquired knowledge that is accumulated by the priestly disposition, care for the soul, and the requisite good works. And there is this advantage that, through acquaintance with the religion of the sacred beings, and certainty as to the reward of the spirit, they make them become more contented in adversity, more intelligent as regards stability of character in difficulty and restriction, and more through knowledge of the abode of hope for those saved. So that it is not fit they should abandon the priesthood, which is both harmless and an employment with advantages that has required much trouble to learn. When they cannot obtain their livelihood, they are to seek it by agriculture, sheep-rearing, penmanship, or other proper employment among priests; and when it is not possible for them to live even by these, they are to seek it by bearing arms, hunting, or other proper employment in the profession of a virtuous warrior.” *Tr. n.*]

As clearly appears, the Āthravans were under a common head, who bore the title of *Zarathushtrotema*, plainly derived from the name of the founder of the *Mazdayasnian* religion. The *Zarathushtrotema* is mentioned along with the lord of the village, the president of the district, and the prince of the country. They all represent the executive political power,¹ which possessed the highest spiritual and religious authority.

The attributes of the priest are chiefly of a spiritual kind. Whilst the warriors implore the divine beings to grant them swift horses, victory in battle and in the chariot-race, the priests pray for wisdom.²

But priestly science, comprising the understanding of the Holy Texts and of ritual observances, was imparted by means of religious instruction. The relation between teachers and disciples is not unfrequently referred to in the Avesta. I myself have alluded to it above.³

According to the respective functions which the priests discharged when offerings were made, they were divided into several sections. The priest who presided at the performance of the ceremony, was the *Zautar*. He had to recite the liturgy. The others took part in the sacred rites as his assistants.

In a later age a single priest, *Ratu* or *Raspi* performed the functions of the assisting priests. At first these various functions were allotted to each person separately. One priest crushed the *Hauma*-plant in a mortar; another tended the fire; a third had to bring the vessels required in the offering; a fourth had the special duty of fetching the water; a fifth cleansed the vessels; the sixth and seventh had no distinctive ceremonial functions assigned to them; apparently, it was their business to perform the purification and to hear the confession.⁴

§5. *Warriors and Peasants, Manufacturers and Slaves.*

Whilst the Avesta is rich in information as to the duties and rights of the priesthood, it tells us little concerning the other orders, which nevertheless formed, there cannot be the least doubt, by far the greater part of the people.

Besides the Āthravans, the Zoroastrian documents particularly mention the *Rathaishtar*, the warriors, and the *Vāstrya-fshuyat*, the peasantry.⁵

¹ Ys. I. 6; cf. *visya*, *zañtuma* and *daggyuma* in 3, 4, 5. In Visp. I. 9, the *Zarathushtrotema* seems to be described as *āhuirish daggyuma*.

² *Mastim . jaidhyāontī . spāncmcha*, Yt. V. 86.

³ Cf. *supra* p. 147.

⁴ *Hāvanan* (from *hāvana*, "mortar," from the root *hu*=Skr. *su*); *ātare-vakhsha* (root *vakhsh*, "to grow, to wax, to increase"); *fraburetare* (root *bar* with *fra*); *ā-beretare*; *ānatāre* (root *snā*, "to wash, to bathe"); *rathwīshkare* (?) and *sraoshā-varez*, Vsp. III. 4; Vd. V. 57. According to the former passage the *Ratu* alone performs all these functions.

⁵ The regular order is: *āthravān*, *rathashtare*, *vāstrya-fshuyat*, Vd. V. 28, XIII. 44; Ys. XI. 6, XIII. 3; Vsp. III. 2; Yt. XIX. 7, and often.

Neither the priesthood nor the profession of arms is mentioned in the Gāthās. The peasants, on the other hand, are frequently named under their official designation, for in that early period they made up the whole people. The priests formed as yet no separate order. There were, I am inclined to believe, only a few individuals who went from village to village as missionaries and preachers to propagate the new doctrine. But as yet there were no people who adopted the military profession without troubling themselves about agriculture. Every peasant was at the same time a fighting man, who was ready to defend his property against enemies in time of danger.

The warrior class may be regarded as a kind of rural gentry composed of the most opulent landlords, who could entrust to their servants the management of their estates and had, therefore, sufficient leisure to exercise themselves in the use of arms.

There is no doubt that every one who was capable of bearing arms, was bound to render military service. Nevertheless, not every Irānian who took the field was, therefore, ranked amongst the knights or champions. The latter evidently fought in battle on chariots, from which the whole order took its name.¹ Consequently, when a war broke out, it was the duty of the cavalier to provide himself with a chariot, while in time of peace it was necessary that he should exercise himself in fighting from the chariot.

The body of champions was, certainly, of special importance to the prince or sovereign. In them he had a number of warriors prepared to support him. In case of war, as soon as the enemy attacked the country, they were ready to follow him into the field. They were, I believe, likewise able to command great masses of the people, who could only in times of extreme danger exchange the plough for the sword and lance, while they were also useful in stimulating the courage of the army by their own example.

So it is probable that the sovereign mostly endeavoured to gain the knights or champions over to his party. They formed his retinue, even his constant attendants. In the neighbourhood of his mansion chivalrous feats and warlike exercises were diligently practised.

Thus arose gradually a military nobility who, besides their larger estates acquired a privileged social position. Several personages are called "champions" in the Avesta. Such a one is Tūsa, the conqueror of the equestrian

¹ *Rathashtare* or *rathashtāo* comes from the locative *rathas* and root *stā*; hence "standing on the chariot." In Sanskrit it corresponds to *ratheshthā*, and *ratheshtha*, which, however do not signify any profession. [Vide Professor Max Duncker's History of Anti-quity, Abbott's edition, vol. V. p. 186: "That a warlike nobility of a highly important and pre-eminent character, attitude, and position, existed in Eastern Irān is the less to be doubted, as the order of warriors in the Avesta is denoted by a name (*rathashtar*) which goes back to the chariots of war." Tr. n.]

tribe of the Hunus. Seated on horseback, he prays to the Anāhita for strength to his team and for victory over his enemies. With a similar prayer do the champions generally address themselves to Mithra.¹

Mithra himself is often styled a champion or chariot-warrior. He drives his horses along the heavens and takes part in battles. Srausha is similarly represented. Fire, too, as being the powerful element fighting in tempests, is called a warrior.²

It is self-evident that the number of the champions was limited. Probably there were few large estates in Eastern Irān. The fertile soil, broken up as it was in most districts, did not at all allow of the formation of large estates. On the contrary, the land was, as it were by nature, divided into a great number of small farms.

Small farmers were certainly more numerous, and comprised the greatest portion of the people. And it is for this reason alone that we learn nothing particular as regards this class as such, its political organization, duties, and rights, whereas its occupation, viz., the breeding of cattle and the tilling of the soil has already been discussed. Only occasionally does the Avesta speak of industry and labour, as well as early rising, as characteristics of the farmer.³

We must enter more into detail in discussing the question whether there existed an order of manufacturers, and what their social position was in the Avesta State.

The division of the people into priests, warriors, and farmers is frequently met with in the Avesta. This threefold classification is so firmly established that we cannot possibly suppose the existence of a fourth order possessing *equal rights*.

Only from a single passage of the Yasna might we be tempted to draw another conclusion. But I believe that this passage only apparently contradicts the other statements of the Avesta. Along with the names of the priests, warriors, and farmers it also mentions a fourth class, that of the *Hūti*, which term cannot but mean "manufacturer."⁴

¹ Yt. V. 53, X. 11.; cf. *Supra*. pp. 228, 229. Titles of honour conferred on the *rathas* *shṭāo* are : *takhma* (Yt. V. 86) and *aurvat* (Ys. IX. 22 ; Yt. V. 85). As attributes of the warrior the following are mentioned in Vd. XIII. 45: (1) *raptō . paurvaꝑibyo* ; (2) *aipijātō . gūm . hudhaoꝑhem* ; (3) *parō . pascha . nmānahē*.

² Yt. X. 25, 102, 112 ; Yt. XI. 19 ; Ys. LVII. 34 ; Nyāj. V. 6 ; Sir. I. 9 ; Ys. LXII. 8.

³ Vd. XIII. 46 : *Za:nagha . evistō qafna . yatha . vāstryō-fshuyās , parō . pascha . nmānahē . yatha . vāstryō-fshuyās , paschaparō . nmānahē . yatha . vāstryō-fshuyās*.

⁴ Ys. XIX. 17. *Kāish . pishtrāish ? Āthrava , rathasṭhāo , vāstryō-fshuyās , hūtiish* "what are the *pishtras* ? The priest, the warrior, the farmer, the manufacturer." We must lay some stress upon the word *pishtra*. It cannot, I believe, mean "order" in its judicial or political sense, but perhaps "skilfulness, calling" (from root *pis*=Skr. *piç*., "to make skilful"). Tradition explains the word *hūti* by *hūtūksh* (cf. Mod. Pers. *takshā*), Sanskrit *praktikarman*. In later times this fourfold classification is naturally employed in all passages. When manufactures began to thrive, the order of manufactures gained respect and dignity. Cf. *Mkh.* chap. XXXII. 2 ; LIX. 1-10., Yet it is characteristic that in the Minokhired too, "misbelief," *dush-garōishni*, is called *āhō*, the special sin of the *hūtūkshā* (Dr. West, *Mkh.* Glossary s. v.)

Yet the passage does not contain a single syllable concerning the political or social position of the four estates with regard to each other. It treats merely of the nature of different callings and occupations; consequently, we are not entitled to conclude that the *Hūti* were classed together with the other orders. The passage does not at all touch upon this question. However, the contrary is proved by the continual and official threefold division of the Avesta mentioned in other passages.

So we are only at liberty to infer from this passage of the Yasna that manufacturers were not confined to domestic industry, but were carried on by a particular class of the population. This hypothesis has already been stated in another part of this work, and it is suggested to us by the variety and the comparatively high perfection of the arts, which, according to the Avesta, existed in ancient Irān.¹

Furthermore, we may conclude that the manufacturers were not a subdivision of the third order. Such a supposition ought to be founded on substantial grounds. The title given to the peasantry exclusively regards the two functions of the farmer, viz., agriculture and cattle-breeding. No other function is at all presupposed.

So there remains only a *single* possible theory, namely, that besides the fully authorized members of the Avesta commonwealth, divided into priests warriors, and farmers, there existed also an inferior section of the population consisting of handicraftsmen.²

It cannot be stated whether this section was servile or semi-servile, or whether its members were personally independent but without any political *status*.

It is not improbable that it was composed of the remnants of the aboriginal population of Irān, which had submitted to the immigrating Arians. The conquered race remained in a kind of dependence. Yet it is certain that the ancient hostility gradually died out, and that they were, as early as in the Avesta epoch, thoroughly peaceful. Perhaps the subjugated people were admitted, at least partially, into the community of the Mazdayasna, but without being allowed any political rights.

As was customary in those times, all the landed property was claimed by the immigrating conquerors. However, the less honourable occupations of handicraft were left to the vanquished race.

But if it be true that the primitive population of Irān belonged to the so-called Tūrānian race, which inhabited Mesopotamia before the immigration of the Semites, we may understand why objects made of metal are especially

¹ *Vide Supra.* p. 53.

² Amongst the Indians the order of Vaiçyas, too, comprised husbandmen, merchants, and artisans,

described as various and ingenious by the Avesta. In the original home of the Tūrānians, among the slopes of the Altai mountains, where metals are found in abundance, and near the surface of the soil, that people had acquired in the most ancient times the arts of the miner, founder, and goldsmith, and had subsequently spread further and further in their wanderings to the South-West.¹

We can also imagine that the conquered aborigines were deprived of their personal liberty. In that case they formed or made up at least the main portion of the servile population. In that period, as in ancient Rome, manufactures may have been carried on by slaves.

There is hardly any doubt that in the Avesta State there existed a servile class, since it is known that every freeman might pawn away his freedom.²

But the principal increase in the number of slaves was, I suppose, effected by the numerous wars waged by the Avesta people. Captives taken in war were kept by their conquerors as servants and slaves. As such they formed, I believe, part of the household of the Mazdayasna, where they seem to have been treated kindly and humanely.

The wives and daughters of the conquered enemies were likewise a desirable prize. As menials in the houses of their conquerors, they very often knew how to gain the love of their masters through their beauty and wanton ways. They were, I believe, the *Jahika*, against whom the Avesta so emphatically warns the faithful.³

Identical customs existed among the Vedic Indians. By *Dāsa*, the name applied to the aboriginal population of the Panjāb, are also meant slaves. This proves that the two notions really coincide, and that the *Dāsas*, falling into the hands of the Arians, were kept and employed as slaves.⁴ So, too, if the Rig-veda expressly recognises in the *Dāsa*-women dangerous enemies of the Arians, this fact must be founded, I imagine, on grounds similar to those which called for the admonition of the Avesta against wanton women.⁵

The term by which the Avesta actually designates, though only in two passages, the servile class, is *Vaisu*.⁶

The *Vaisu*, as it seems, ranked in the family between women and little children. For the purification of one of them the fee to the priest was an animal (a beast of burden) fit for carrying burdens. Thus slaves were evidently

¹ Rawlinson, "The Five Great Monarchies," vol. I. pp. 98-99; Maspero, *Gdm V* p. 137.

² See above, pp. 37-38.

³ Cf. Vd. XIII. 46, 48; Yt. XVII. 57-58.

⁴ Zimmer, *AltL.* pp. 107 seq. See also Grassmann, *Wtb. s.v. dāsa*, 3rd meaning.

⁵ Rv. 2. 20.7; 3. 20. 10.

⁶ *Va?su* from *vis*, "to go to meet, to serve." Its connection with Sanskrit *vaiçya* is not certain.

regarded as members of the family and their possession very highly valued. They might likewise be admitted into the religious community, and were subject to the ritual laws of the Avesta. But the Vaisu bore at the same time an appellation, which doubtless indicates in my opinion his menial character.¹

In another passage the Vaisu is called "amusing" or "making music." So the servants had apparently the duty of diverting and amusing their masters by their arts. The very same epithets are also applied to the "wanton women," and this very fact induces me to believe that the latter were also slaves in the house of the Mazdayasna.²

In order to give the reader a better notion of the social position of the Vaisu, I may perhaps refer to that of the *Çudra* in the Brāhmanic commonwealth. They were compelled to render personal service to Brāhmans, Kshtriya and Vaicya. So they were, like the Vaisu, a menial class. Nevertheless they—we suppose the Vaisu also—were allowed to work and earn their livelihood as artisans.

Here they may be compared to the Lūris dwelling in Baloochistān Proper. They are, according to the description of M. Bellew,³ a kind of gipsies. In small parties formed of a couple of families they are met with throughout the whole country. They do not belong to the race of the Brahuis or the Baloochees. They have no landed property, nor do they cultivate the fields of others. They are partly vagrant musicians wandering from one village to another, and partly engaged in humble industries, such as pottery, rope-making and mat-making.

It would be an anachronism to regard the Vaisus and the Lūris as perfectly identical. The latter, according to an account of the *Shāh-nāme*, were induced by Behrāmīgūr or Varāhrān V. (Vullers, pp. 417-438) to emigrate from India to Irān. Nor can they be called slaves, since they personally remained totally free and independent.

§ 6. *The Mutual Relations of the several Orders.*

Tradition traces the institution of separate orders to Zarathushtra.⁴ He is not merely the founder of the Parsi Religion; succeeding generations revere

¹ Vd. IX. 38. *Pairi-aetaru* comes from root *i* with *pairi*, "to go about, to serve." Also Sanskrit *paryetr*, "one who has got something in his power." may be referred to for comparison. So we might, perhaps, translate *pairi-aetaru* in its passive sense, "being in the power of, belonging to."

² Vd. XIII. 46: *qandrakara*, "making music" or "merrymaking" = Phlv. *khunāk-kar* = Mod. Pers. *khunā-gar*. Other common appellations of the Vaisu and Jahika are: *asna-rāzsha* ("causing damage by any close contact(?)"), *zairimayfsmān* and *thryafsmān*, the meanings of which are very obscure.

³ "From the Indus to the Tigris," p. 52. Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. p. 550 note.

⁴ [Comp. Spiegel, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. III. pp. 554 *seq.*—"Just as in India the *Purūshasūktā* endeavours to explain the descent of castes, so do we find also in Irān legendary statements concerning the origin of the different orders, which they ascribe

him at the same time, as the author of the most important political institutions. The Avesta, therefore, calls him the first Priest, the first King, and the first Agriculturist.¹

According to the Bundeshesh, Zarathushtra had three sons, who are, likewise, mentioned in the Avesta; they are called *Isatvāstra*, *Hvarchithra*, *Urvatatnara*. The first was the head of the priests. To him are ascribed the foundation and organization of the priesthood. The second was the commander-in-chief in war. The third was the chief of the agricultural population.²

Firdūsī also hands down a legend concerning the origin of the orders, which is traced back to the days of Yima. I do not think it necessary to endeavour to reconcile this legend with the narrative of the Avesta and of the Bundeshesh³; for we have here to deal merely with a legend, which can, and will, at all times spread, develop and change with great freedom. And it is perfectly clear why a poet like Firdūsī should give the legend a character different from what we find in the theological books, such as the Avesta and the Bundeshesh.

to the earliest period. According to the *Book of Kings*, Yima organized the different orders; and this assumption is also quite reasonable, for as Yima was, according to the Irānian legend, the founder of the political organization, he ought naturally to have been also the author of the social classification. On the other hand, according to the view of the priests, Zarathushtra was the first founder of the three estates, which were after him continued by his sons. It is extremely difficult to reconcile these two accounts with one another, for, according to the legend, Zarathushtra appears only in times far distant from the age of Yima, i.e., under Vishtāspa, and we cannot believe that the Irānian state could have existed thousands of years without a division into classes having taken place. The difficulty may be explained if we may assume that Zarathushtra lived in the age of Yima, and that with his help Yima organized the state; and some passages may be adduced as an indirect proof of this statement. The *Book of Kings* speaks not merely of the fire altar but also of the Avesta as in existence long before Zarathushtra. It must, likewise, strike us when it is said in Vd. II. 143 that Urvatatnara, the son of Zarathushtra, was King in the Vara of Yima, for it is strange indeed that this Vara of Yima should have remained without a chief until the time of King Vishtāspa. However, the assumption that Zarathushtra lived in the reign of Yima is very inconvenient, since in that case we must not only destroy the entire sacred chronology, but also separate Zarathushtra from Vishtāspa, with whom he is nevertheless coupled in the Avesta. A second and less violent expedient is to ascribe a distinct origin to the priestly legend eliminated by us in vol. I. p. 659, so that Yima on the one side, and Vishtāspa and Zarathushtra on the other, ran parallel and were blended together, in a later period only, in the manner now current.

The result at which we finally arrive (after minute research) is this, that the rise of the civilization of the Irānians is related in two different narratives; while the one traces it to Yima, according to the other Zarathushtra is said to be its pioneer. If doubts exist as to the author of that civilization, there is even greater difficulty in determining the region in which, from the Irānian point of view, it had its origin." *Tr. n.]*

¹ Yt. XIII. 88-89 : *paoiryāi . athaurunē, paoiryāi.rathæshthāi, paoiryāi.vāstryāi. fshuyantē.*

² Bdh. chap. XXXIII. 5; West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 142.

³ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. pp. 549-550.

It is the purpose of the legend, to give to some important institution the character of high antiquity, no matter whether it names Zarathushtra or his sons, or even the ancient Yima as its founder.

The passage in Firdūsī runs as follows :—¹

“Of all who pursued the same trade,² Jemshīd convoked an assembly, to which he devoted fifty years.”

“First the tribe³ called Kātuziyān (or *Amōziyān*).⁴ Know that these are devoted to the observance of public worship.”

“He separated them from the rest of the people and gave them the mountains as their dwelling-place.

“In order to live there in adoration and meditation before the Bright Lord of the Universe.

“In the second place he set those who are named *Nīsāriyān*.

“They are those who fight with the courage of the lion ; who shine before the army and the countries.

“Who shelter the throne of the King and maintain the glory of virtue.

“The third, know ye, bears the name *Nāsūdi*. To nobody have they to pay homage.⁵

“Blameless they work and sow and reap and nourish themselves.

“They need not obey anybody, though their garments are poor (*i.e.*, they are meanly clad) ; and their ears are free from the sound of calumny.

“They are free, and the cultivation of the earth is their charge ; they know neither enemies nor lawsuits.

“For a wise and noble-minded man says : *Laziness makes the free man a slave*.

“The fourth order comprises those who are called the *Ahnūkhushi* ;⁶ they are active for gain, and full of arrogance.

“Their business is to manufacture ; their soul is continually full of fear.”

¹ *Shāh-nāmc*, ed. Vullers, vol. I. p. 24, ll. 17 seq. Cf. Mohl, *Le Livre des Rois* (“The Book of Kings”), vol. I. pp. 34 seq.

² The original text has *peshah*, corresponding to the Avesta *pishtu* (*vide* p. 62).

³ Firdūsī uses the word *guroh* “*caterva*, horde, crowd” ; so too further below.

⁴ Mohl’s edition has *āmōziyān*. The word comes from *āmōkhtan*, “to teach.”

⁵ Mohl : “They pay no homage to any person.” Vullers (*Lexicon*, s.v. *sipās*) :—“*quibus nemo gratias agit*,” “whom nobody thanks.”

⁶ This name is full of interest. Evidently it is identical with the Pahlavi *ahunvakhshi* [The Persian word *ahnūkhushi* (*ahunavakhshi*) is, I believe, corrupted from the Pahlavi *hutokhshi* (from *hu*, “good,” and *thwakhsh*, “to endeavour”) industry, artizanship, the profession of artizans. To my knowledge the word *ahunvakhshi* rarely occurs in Pahlavi. *Tr. n.*]

The tradition of the Shāh-nāme entirely agrees with the views of the Avesta. It distinguishes four orders, just as the passage of the Yasna often referred to above. The independence of the farmers and the enjoyment in their profession of rights equal to those of the priests and warriors, are specially emphasized. However, the inferiority of the fourth order no less plainly appears. There is no doubt but handicrafts are regarded as less honourable ; those who follow them are considered as not free and morally inferior.

Let us now set aside the fourth order and consider the mutual relations which subsisted between the priests, warriors and farmers. The first question, no doubt, is :—Whether we have here before us *castes* or *orders* ?

Two things are characteristic of and essential to the existence of caste.¹ Wherever these are wanting, we cannot speak of castes, but only of orders.

Firstly, the caste must be hereditary, from father to son, in strict conformity to law. The order is fixed and determined by birth. It is possible that one may sink into a lower caste, while it is impossible for him to rise to a higher grade.

Secondly, a lawful intermarriage between members of different castes cannot take place. Whenever such a marriage is contracted, it is either regarded only as concubinage, or the children are assigned to the lower caste nay, perhaps, to the very lowest in the scale.

I know no passage of the Avesta or of the late traditional writings, which bears testimony to the existence of both these characteristics in the orders of the Avesta. However, this silence is not in itself conclusive.

But various reasons, chiefly intrinsic ones, disprove the existence of real castes in ancient Irān. I refer to the words of Dr. Spiegel, who has already demonstrated this fact in a convincing manner : ²

“We regard the caste as a luxury, which can only be allowed in opulent countries. Castes are definitely proved to exist only in countries such as India and Egypt, where their existence may be easily conceived.”³ These two

¹ Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. p. 551.

² Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. pp. 546 *seq.*

³ The subject treated of here is closely connected with the question whether the Arians of the Rig-veda had any castes among them. Whilst Ludwig (*Einleitung*, pp. 216 *seq.*) agreeing with Haug and Kern, affirms it, it is denied by Zimmer (*AltL.* pp. 186 *seq.*) Aufrecht, Benfey, Muir, M. Müller, Roth and Weber. I am also of opinion that the existence of castes is inconceivable in the times and circumstances of the Rig-veda. Without any regard to other reasons I should rely principally on an argument which, as far as I know, has not yet been advanced. There cannot be any doubt that castes can only be found in a complete and settled commonwealth, in which alone the necessary control could be exercised, and suitable and effective measures taken against any violation of the laws of caste. Even in our days the caste-system in India gives rise to most of the lawsuits. However, the views of the people are to a great extent humanized by English influence.

countries are extremely fertile and rich in natural productions. The farmer in particular can derive from the cultivation of a relatively small piece of ground whatever he requires for the maintenance of himself and his family ; hence he can afford to distribute the surplus among those who serve him in various ways. The above-mentioned countries have also a very genial climate, which enables their inhabitants to be contented with little ; for their living and clothing cost but little in comparison with what is necessary in less favoured climates. Wherever such facilities for earning a livelihood exist, castes, in my opinion, must naturally be formed.”

But all these circumstances, which favour or facilitate the rise and development of castes, are not at all to be met with in Irān. Here the soil is on the whole supposed to be extremely poor. In many parts it can be used only for pasture ; and, wherever agriculture is possible, it requires most careful cultivation, much labour and diligence.

The climate is anything but genial. It is a continental climate in the full sense of the word, varying between the extremes of heat and cold. Any restriction to a particular kind of vocation is out of the question. Otherwise, the people would soon feel the effects of famine. In Irān every one must work according to his strength and ability and without any long relaxation in order to make a living.

The Āthravans, perhaps, form a solitary exception. Yet, even regarding them, it is uncertain whether they had no other sources of income than the exercise of their priestly functions.

If the orders of priests, warriors, and farmers had been castes, there would certainly have been invented some myth representing this division as eternal and ordained by God. Brahmanical legends of such a kind are not wanting. But it is actually a priestly tradition which describes the three orders as being of one nature and one kind. Indeed, the Avesta derives all the three orders from Zarathushtra, whereby they are bound together rather than sundered.

The mutual blending of the orders can even be proved, I believe, from the Avesta itself.

It is expressly said that Hauma refuses to women who do not render him due honour, the birth of an Āthravan, and, generally, a happy delivery.¹

What a complicated judicial system must have existed in the Vedic antiquity ! A commonwealth so organized no doubt existed in the Brahmana in the valley of the Ganges. Yet the Arians of the Indus and of the Panjāb did not possess it, since they had no settled home, but were in course of migration from West to East. Under such varying circumstances there could not rise and take deep root an institution which, more than any other, bears the stamp of stability, solidity, and ossification, and which, no doubt, presupposes a development of centuries before it can be regarded as permanent.

¹ Ys. X. 15 : *noit . tām . āthravō . puhrīm* naḍha . dasti . huputhrīm.*

Here we must suppose that the son of every woman, at least in theory, could become a priest. It was certainly the eager desire of all women in ancient Irān to be blessed with sons who might participate in this high honour.

The same idea is implied in a curse which is pronounced against the despisers of Hauma. "In such a house (*where Hauma is despised*) no Āthravan shall be born, nor warrior, nor farmer."¹

It is thus proved that not even the Āthravans formed a caste properly so called. Yet there cannot be any doubt that in course of time they constituted themselves a class distinct from the other orders. It must have gradually become a recognised rule that only the sons of priests should be ordained as priests. At least such had naturally a preferential claim to this privileged rank.

We know how jealously the Āthravans watched that no one, who was not entitled, should enter their circle and assume their rights. So they formed at all events a well-organized order, and admission into it was subject to certain conditions.

Among the modern Parsis the sacerdotal dignity is inherited from father to son. A layman cannot acquire it. A priest, on the contrary, is free to embrace another calling.² Thus usage has become established in course of time and has acquired the force of law.

The priesthood held generally an isolated position among the Avesta people and in the commonwealth.

I really believe that the Āthravans were not properly natives of Eastern Irān.³ They had their principal seat in Media whence they emigrated to the East. It was by such emigrant priests that the doctrine of Zarathushtra was

¹ Ya, XI. 6. The passage might also be construed as follows: "In the house of a priest (*where Hauma is despised*) shall be born no priest (*i.e.*, no son at all), in the house of a warrior no warrior, in that of a farmer no farmer." Yet this translation seems rather strained. A much stronger expression is used in the passage addressed to every man of the tribe: "The despiser of Hauma shall have no free son at all."

² Dosabhoj Framji: "The Parsis," p. 227; ("History of the Parsis," 2nd ed. vol. II. p. 235): "The priest does not acquire his position from sacerdotal fitness or superior learning. Strictly speaking he cannot be called a spiritual guide. The son of a priest is also a priest, unless he chooses to follow another profession, which is not prohibited to him. But a layman cannot be a priest. They resemble the Levites"; and p. 237: "The present 'dasturs', or chief priests, among the Parsis in Bombay, namely, Dastur Peshotanji the successor of the learned and renowned Edaldaru (Sanjana), and Dastur Jamaspji, successor of the well-known Edaldaru Jamaspasana, are intelligent and well-informed men, possessing a considerable knowledge of their religion; but some of the priesthood are profoundly ignorant of its first principles. As the minds of the Parsi people have now been awakened, and as active measures have been and are being devised for improvement, the darkness and gloom of the past will doubtless be succeeded by a bright dawn in the future." Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. p. 567, note 3.

³ Cf. Spiegel, *E.A.*, vol. III. pp. 554 *seq.*, pp. 561-567.

announced to the people of Balkh, Merv, and Herāt, of Soghd and Khvarizm, of Seistan and Kābul.

This opinion is strongly confirmed by what is stated in the Parsi legend regarding Zoroaster. It represents the Prophet as coming from Rai or Ragha to Balkh, to the court of King Vishtāspa, and preaching there the new faith.

I will not deny that this legend is extremely imperfect. However, it is utterly impossible to believe that this tradition should have no foundation in fact. We do not gain anything whatever by rejecting tradition as mere nonsense and absurdity. Such an assertion must not be maintained without convincing reasons. It is our task to extract the kernel of truth contained in traditions but hidden under a mass of legend and poetry! If we act otherwise, we, indeed, destroy the old edifice of tradition, only to raise in its place another which stands on no foundation whatever.

If we eliminate from the Zoroastrian legend the royal court of Vishtāspa and the kingly palaces; if we lay aside the learned disputations and the intrigues of the court; nay more, the very name of Zarathushtra, as being the only historical personage, I should have no objection to offer. However, this fact must, I believe, remain—as being the nucleus and basis of the entire legend—that the Avesta religion was introduced among the Eastern Irānians from the West, and that it was brought to them by the order of priests immigrating from the West.

It even seems that only a small portion of that priesthood had settled in Eastern Irān. The majority wandered about homeless like the Jewish Levites and the Mohammedan *Mollahs*. They taught and preached and earned their living by occasionally performing their medical or sacerdotal functions in cases of disease or impurity.

The “coming of the Āthravans” is celebrated in the Avesta. They come from afar bringing piety into the countries.¹ Before they immigrated from their distant home into Eastern Irān piety had not dwelt there, but a creed different from that which is taught by the Avesta. The people still followed the old Arian religion of nature.

The same fact is implied in the tradition which puts into the mouth of Kersāni the words:—“No more shall an Āthravan come into my country to make proselytes!”² Kersāni is apparently a legendary prince, who counteracts the missionary work of the Āthravans. It is further related that Hauma vanquished him and deprived him of his power. This evidently means that the priests succeeded through divine aid in breaking the resistance of that prince and in gaining over his people to their new doctrine.

¹ Ys. XLII. 6; *athaurunām . paīti-ajāthrem . yazamaidē . yōi iēū (? ayā).dūrāt. ashō-ishō . dagyunām.*

² Ys. IX. 24; *nōit . mē . apām . āthrava . aiwishtish . veredhyē . danhava . charāt.*

That the priests in the very epoch of the Avesta were in still an unsettled condition and wandered through the country, may perhaps be inferred from their appellation, "wandering through the countries," by which, it seems, the *Āthravans* are designated in the texts.¹

In Ragha, that is in Media, the *Āthravans* had their home. Here resided the *Zarathushtrōtema*, and hence the priests had evidently emigrated to the East. In Ragha they had not only spiritual but even secular power.

This is confirmed by the Avesta, according to which there were generally five chiefs. The first is the master of the house, the second the headman of the village, the third the head of the tribe, and the fourth the prince of the country. The fifth is the *Zarathustra* or the *Zarathushtrōtema*, the chief of the *Āthravans*, who was, at least according to the notions of the priests, above all secular potentates.

Ragha affords the only exception. Here there are but four chiefs; the fourth is the *Zarathushtra*. Thus in Media he unites the spiritual and secular power in his own person. He is not only the chief of the clergy, but at the same time also a country-prince in Ragha.²

Hence we may infer that the *Āthravans* came from Media, where they had their permanent abode. Their chief resided in the ancient metropolis of the country.

Under such circumstances it must be admitted that the supposition that the *Āthravans* were identical with the Magi, in so far as they had spread over Eastern Irān, is very natural. It is not strange, that they received in the new country a different title from that which they had in their native land and in Persia. At all events, what we know about the Magi perfectly agrees with what is related of the *Āthravans*. It is uncertain whether the designation

¹ *Danhāurvaōsa*, Vsp. III. 3; Gāh. IV. 8; Yt. XXIV. 17.

² The passage (Ys. XIX. 18) is treated at full length by Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. III. p. 563. I cannot but agree entirely with his opinion. The original text runs:—*Kaya . ratavō? Nmānyō, vīsyō, zañtūmō, zarathushtrō . pukhdhō; āoghām . daqyunām . yāō . anyāō . rajōit . zarathushtroit . Chathru-ratush . Ragha . zarathushtrish ; kaya . anhāō ratavō? Nmānyascha . vīsyascha . zantumascha, zarathushtrō . tuiryō.* "Who are chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the prince of the country, the fifth is the *Zarathushtra*. (So it is) in the countries outside the *Zarathushtrian* Empire (?). The *Zarathushtrian* Ragha has four chiefs. Who are these chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the fourth is the *Zarathushtra*." I observe that the tradition renders the word *zarathushtra* simply by *zartushtum*. The change of the word *rajoit*, into *raghoit* is not obvious. The form of it would be objectionable even now.

Magu (used elsewhere) occurs in the Avesta ; yet it is not altogether improbable.¹

There is no doubt that the Magi were a Median tribe.² Yet we know that they had spread also over Persia. Here they formed the priesthood, which, as regards customs and usages, greatly differed from the rest of the people. Hence Herodotus expressly distinguishes them from the Persians.³

We can only correctly understand the rebellion of the pseudo-Bardija, whom Darius calls of the Magi, if we look upon it as a reaction of the Median tribe against the ascendancy of the Persians.⁴

Ammianus Marcellinus, too, speaks of Media in a manner worthy of credence, as the native country of the Magi. Here lay their fertile lands and fields, whence they departed to consecrate themselves for centuries exclusively to the worship of the divinities. It is particularly related that they maintained the eternal fires, which were originally kindled from a holy flame that had once fallen from heaven.

Finally, I must refer to a passage in Yāqūt alluded to by Dr. Spiegel, according to which the last chief of the Magi died in the fortress of Ushtunāvend near Rai. His residence was, therefore, near that primeval Rāgha, wherein also the Avesta places the seat of the chief of the Āthravans.

We can now understand the nature and origin of the civilization of the Avesta people. It does not occur to me to locate their scene of activity in Western Irān, especially in Media. Some portion of the people, it is true, dwelt, according to the Avesta, on Median soil, but the majority, no doubt, had their home in Eastern Irān.

However, Media was apparently not only the starting-point for the propagation of a new belief, but also for the spread of a new culture. The Āthravans during their missionary labours not only introduced their religion into the East, but also their civilization. And thus we can conceive why in the Avesta a social amelioration is combined with the religious reform.

The civilization of Media may have been in many respects superior to that of the East. There the nature of the soil is by far more favourable to agriculture and permanent settlements, and not such as to necessitate a nomadic life.

¹ In Ys. LXV. 6, the term *mogu-tbīsh* is found along with other designations of the adversaries of the Zoroastrian religion. It is often, and I believe not without some reason, translated "hating the Magi." Certainly everybody will admit that nothing is essentially proved or refuted by the droll remark : "the little word *maghu* or *moghu* has quite innocently incurred the suspicion of magic." (*ZdmG.* vol. XXXIV. p. 715, note).

² Herod. I. 101.

³ Herod. I. 104.

⁴ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. II. pp. 304 seq.

We need not suppose that the Āthravans were entirely strangers to the inhabitants of Eastern Irān as regards their customs and language. I believe they belonged to those Irānian tribes, which had advanced furthest to the West; but, having been separated locally from their tribal brethren, and living under particular conditions of soil and climate, they had developed independently.

Naturally, the Āthravans first attached themselves in Eastern Irān to that portion of the people which most resembled them in culture and civilization. They sought and found their first support among those tribes that had already been accustomed, more or less, to the cultivation of the soil as well as to settled dwellings.

Starting from this centre they endeavoured to extend their civilizing influence also among the wild and independent tribes. And, indeed, their doctrine, pervaded by pious zeal, was useful also for practical purposes, so that it was calculated more than any other religion to mitigate the ruggedness of the country and of its people.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE HOME AND AGE OF THE AVESTA.*

General Remarks.

IN writing my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians in Ancient Times," I did not devote a separate section to the question respecting the home and age of the Avesta. I believed that the list of geographical names occurring in the Avesta would suffice its Eastern Irānian origin, and that a description of the state of civilization it depicts would be enough to prove its great antiquity.

I have since been charged by my reviewers—with the exception of the criticism of M. Tomaschek, (*Ausland*, 1883, No. 42)—with over-estimating the age of the Avesta, and disregarding the important arguments in favour of its Median origin. I am, therefore, compelled to go more fully into the subject in order to justify the view I have adopted. I shall begin with the two following statements:—

- (1) The country in which the civilization of the Avesta people took its rise, was really Eastern Irān.
- (2) It is a civilization of great antiquity, and dates back at least to a time antecedent to the Median and Persian kings.

* This treatise entitled *Vaterland und Zeitalter des Awesti und seiner Kultur*, was suggested to Dr. Geiger by Prof. Kuhn and was first published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Vgl. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 3rd May 1884.

I shall now make it my task separately to verify these two statements, and meet the arguments adduced on the opposite side.¹ I shall also endeavour not to overlook any of those arguments, claiming at the same time similar attention to all the reasons I may bring forward on my own side.

A few preliminary remarks before I begin—

1. The expression, "Home of the Avesta," is not quite precise. It may be asked whether it is meant to denote the territorial extent of Zoroastrianism and the home of the Avesta people, or the province to which the Avesta owes its origin. I take the expression in the former sense; for it is not evident whether the Avesta was originally composed in Sogdiana, Merv, or Ragha.² Even if we were to identify the home of Zarathushtra, the place where the Avesta was written would still remain uncertain. The question as to whether we can at all speak of an Eastern Irānian civilization is more practical. The difficulty lies in discovering whether the territory occupied by the Arians of the Avesta differed from that held by the Medes and Persians in historical times.

2. As regards the age of the Avesta, we cannot merely speak of it as "over-estimated." (J. 1. Sp. 1477). The question is simply this:—Is the Avesta of greater antiquity than Medo-Persian history? Is it of more recent date, or contemporary with it?

3. Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 2. pp. 639-640; cf. also Sp. 1 p. 11) says:³ "Now, as regards the theory of a Bactrian origin for the Avesta, only indirect proofs can be brought in support of it, for once only is Bactria directly mentioned by name." Again, Prof. C. de Harlez, (H. 1. p. xlv.): "*On affirme généralement que ce (i.e. the home of the Avesta) fut Bactriane.*" For my own part, as I have

¹ I shall make use of the following abbreviation in quoting from writers to whom I shall have to refer often:—

1 Sp. 1. For Spiegel, *Vishtāspa oder Hystaspes und das Reich der Baktrer*; *Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift*. vol. VIII. pp. 1 seq.

2 Sp. 2. For Spiegel, *Ueber das Vaterland und das Zeitalter des Awestā*; *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. XXXV. 1881, pp. 629 seq.

3 J. 1. For Justi's Review of my *Ostirān. Kultur*, "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians"; *Philolog. Wöchenschrift*, 25th November 1882, No. 47.

4 H. 1. For C. de Harlez, *Avesta traduit*, 2nd ed. Paris, 1881; especially the "Introduction."

5 H. 2. For C. de Harlez, *Le calendrier Persan et le pays originaire du Zoroastrianisme*; *Bulletin de l'Athénée Oriental*, 1881, pp. 79-97, 159-183.

6 H. 3. For C. de Harlez, Review of my *Ostirānische Kultur im Alterthum*; *ibid.*, 1883, pp. 217-225.

7 H. 4. For C. de Harlez, *Origine de l'Avesta et son interpretation*; *Le Muséon*, vol. I. 1882, pp. 494-505.

² I shall speak especially of Ragha at greater length further on.

³ *Was nun die Entstehung des Awestā in Baktrien betrifft, so wird man dafür zumcist nur indirekte Beweise finden müssen, denn direkt wird Baktra nur ein einziges Mal genannt*

suggested in my first remark, I do not believe that the Bactrian country was the special home of the Avesta. I am much more inclined to be guided by the general contrast between Eastern and Western Irān, which appears to me inherent in the nature of the country, and which is so prominent a feature to this day in Persian history.

4. Finally, let me observe that, naturally, I do not look on the Avesta as it now exists as identical with the original Avesta. I entirely agree with Dr. Spiegel, who says (Sp. 2. 638):—"Our Avesta is a prayer-book abridged from the great Avesta for liturgical purposes."¹ But what conclusion must we draw from this? Probably no more than that the Avesta as we have it, is incomplete, and has even in many instances undergone much alteration; nevertheless its substance is entirely derived from the original. However, it is by no means certain, (though not impossible, or rather very probable, and in some cases evident), that in the compilation of this "Manual of Liturgy," much was inserted in the text [*as mere explicative words or commentary*]. In order to distinguish the matter inserted we must discover certain signs. Let me point out some of them. If any phrase disturbs the metre, which would be otherwise regular, it may be regarded as an interpolation. Now the question also arises, whether such phrases are composed by the compiler, or are extracts from some other genuine texts of the Avesta. All isolated passages, and especially such words and expressions as have no proper connection with the context, must be carefully examined. They should only be brought to bear generally on questions concerning the history of civilization, where they in no way contradict the other statements of the Avesta. Above all, we must beware of attaching too great importance to brief and isolated observations. On the contrary, we must be always careful that any passage brought forward as proof can be supported by others. As a rule, the evidence of language is not to be relied on. We do not even know how far the language of the original sacred books was familiar to the compilers of the "Liturgy." That the time which elapsed between the writing of the original Avesta and the compilation of the "Liturgy," was a period of transformation of language, is, so far as I am aware, generally accepted. At best, it is only when grammatical and material evidences coincide, that we may fitly attach importance to the latter.

§ 7. *The Home of the Avesta.*

After what I have said in my opening statement (1) the question may take this form: "What were the places inhabited by the Avesta people? In what country did the civilization represented in the Avesta take its rise and develop itself?" Every one will allow that the answer to these questions must be sought in the first place in the Avesta itself.

¹ *Unser Awestā ist ein Gebetbuch, zu liturgischen Zwecken aus dem grossen Awestā ausgezogen.*

Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 3, pp. 639-640) says :¹ "Moreover, it is incorrect to assert that the Avesta makes no reference at all to Western Irān ; for not only is Lake Urumia (*Chaichasta*) mentioned but also Babylon (*Bawri*). Thus it is familiar with the land west of the borders of Irān. Among the arguments in favour of an Eastern Irānian origin for the Avesta, particular stress is generally laid on the evidence of the register of lands in the first Fargard of the Vendidad, where only names of Eastern Irānian places occur. Without taking into consideration the fact that Ragha and Varena cannot be regarded as Eastern Irānian districts, and leaving out of account *Airyanem vaējagh*, we must nevertheless recollect that in Vendidad, I, 81, it is expressly stated that other places and towns existed whose names did not appear on the register. Besides this, I must confess that I consider the age of this first Fargard to be greatly over-estimated."²

Prof. C. de Harlez agrees with the writer quoted above. (H. 3. p. 222) :

"Puis nous considérerions le pays de l'Avesta comme l'Eran septentrional et non comme oriental. Une région qui s'étend jusqu'au Sud de la Mer Caspienne, ne peut être prise pour l'Orient de l'Eran."

As regards the latter remarks it must be admitted that Ragha does not belong to Eastern Irān ; it lies close to the natural bridge connecting Western and Eastern Irān. Now, if all the other places mentioned are in Eastern Irān, then surely, in spite of Ragha being mentioned, we are justified in speaking of an "Eastern Irānian civilization." It must also at the same time be accepted as a known fact that at this one point only it extended beyond the frontiers of Eastern Irān. The very nature of the country sufficiently explains this circumstance ; for, when the Irānian people had reached the "Bridge of Khorāsān," they must necessarily have gone further westward, for deserts prevented their expansion towards the North and South.

At all events, it will be allowed that the name Eastern Irān is more appropriate than Northern Irān would be. To the latter must, however, belong Ātropātene, while it could never have included such places as *Haitumat*, *Harahvati*, *Pisana*, *Vaikerta*—pure Avesta names—which belong to modern Afghānistān.

¹ "Wenn ferner behauptet wird, das Awestā ignoriere den Westen Irāns vollständig so ist das nicht richtig ; denn das Awestā kennt nicht bloss den Urumiasee (*Tschaitschasta*) sondern selbst Babylon (*Bawri*), seine Kenntniss reicht also westlich noch über die Grenzen Irāns hinaus. Ein besonderes Gewicht wird bei den Beweisen für den ostirānischen Ursprung des Awestā gewöhnlich auf das Länderverzeichnis im ersten Fargard des Vendidad gelegt, wo angeblich nur ostirānische Orte genannt werden. Abgesehen davon, dass Ragha und Varena nicht als ostirānische Landschaften gelten können, um von *Airyanem vaējagh* zu schweigen, so muss man sich erinnern, dass Vd. I. 81 ausdrücklich gesagt wird, dass es noch andere Orte und Plätze gebe. Sonst muss ich gestehen, dass nach meiner Ansicht das Alter dieses ersten Fargards sehr überschätzt wird."

² Cf. similarly Sp. 1, p. 11.

Northern Irān, moreover, has no existence as a geographical division. Between the North and the South, whether towards the West (Media Susiana, Persia), or towards the East (Afhānistān, Baluchistān), there is no natural boundary ; but the central desert of Persia divides the plateau of Irān into Eastern and Western districts. A line drawn from Asterābād through Tehbes to Kirmān, nearly marks the division ; but North and South of the Persian desert the two halves meet again.

The main point of my argument is this :—that, in spite of the reference to Ragha in the Avesta, the greater part of Media, all Ātropātene, Susiana, and Persia, were outside the pale of the Avesta people. But these were the very countries, which, in historical times, were especially the nurseries of the civilization of nations.

Hitherto I have confined myself entirely to meeting the objections of Prof. C. de Harlez to the term “ Eastern Irānian Civilization,” on the ground that Ragha is mentioned in the Avesta. Let us now consider Dr. Spiegel’s remark against which a great deal may be urged.

1. Besides the register of countries in the Vendidad, I also base my theory of an Eastern Irānian origin for the Avesta on the juxtaposition of all the names of places occurring in it, and on the very interesting passage, Yt. X. 13-14 where, speaking of Mithra, the *yazata* of the rising sun, it says :—

“ Who first, decked with gold,
Grasps the bright mountain-tops ;
Thence he looks over the whole land
Of the Arians, the glorious one * * * * where navigable
waters,
Broad with swelling waves, flow
To *Ishkata* and *Poruta*.
To *Moru*, *Haraiva*, and *Gava*,
To *Sughdha* and to *Qārizem*.”¹

Dr. Spiegel does not refer to this passage ; and yet it is of special significance, for in it the name *airyō-shayana* is expressly used for the “ Land of the Arians.” Of the seven names of places it mentions, two, viz., *Ishkata* and *Poruta*,² are unknown ; the others, without exception, are in Eastern Irān, and four of them appear also in the list of countries named in the Vendidad.

¹ Should any one be inclined to consider the words *ā ishkatem to qārizemcha* as an interpolation, the passage would in that case prove even more useful to my argument. The insertion would, of course, be of later date than the original text itself, and would serve as an additional proof that, even during a period later than that in which the Hymn of Mithra, (Yt. X. 13-14), was composed, the *airyō-shayana* was still confined to Eastern Irān.

² C. de Harlez also situates them in Eastern Irān (H. I. p. 448, note 1). *Ibid.* p. xxiv and xli, with reference to the passage cited above from the Mithra Yasht.

Here, then, we have a very important passage, analagous to the register of places often quoted, which indisputably adds to its value.

2. I do not see what arguments can be adduced to disprove the antiquity of the first Fargard of the Vendidad. This document need not be regarded only as an enumeration of tribes, but as a part of the Avesta itself; and that it is of later date than any other part cannot be proved with certainty. If this were so, it would be even more striking, that, with the exception of Ragha, only names of Eastern Irānian places occur in it. Again, we must not be misled by the frequent use of the modern forms of these names, for this is sufficiently explained by the various revisions of the Avesta, during which it is easy to conceive the revisers would have preferred to exchange obsolete names for such as were popularly current, or which at least nearly resembled those in common use.

I may further observe that I do not ascribe to the transcribers of the Avesta the alteration of the names, which was doubtless the work of the revisers, to whom the old terms were, indeed, no longer familiar. Again, the loose grammar of many passages in the Avesta must not be ascribed to careless copying of the manuscript, but rather to the ignorance of editors adapting their own language to the text.

3. The concluding passage, "There are also other places, &c.," proves next to nothing. The places could equally well have been in Eastern Irān, so far as may be inferred from the tone of the writer. At all events it would seem very singular that a Zoroastrian of Western Irān should look on the districts of Eastern Irān only as God-created thus entirely ignoring the claims of his own country.

4. Bawri cannot be mentioned by way of proof. So far as the question relates to the home of the Avesta people, we must confine ourselves to those districts only which are included in Irān. But Bawri was the home of the Dahāka, and therefore situated in a foreign country according to the Avesta. The power of Babylon may probably have been known to the old Irānians, but this is no reason for supposing that it was within the territory of the Avesta people.

5. It is by no means impossible that Chaichasta is Lake Urumia. If so, it forms a singular exception to the numerous other localities mentioned in the Avesta. Perhaps, as in the case of Bawri, we may assume that it was situated beyond the district inhabited by the old Irānians, lying, as a matter of fact, at a considerable distance to the West of their territory. Perhaps it was at some later period that the name Chaichasta was given to Lake Urumia. But upon this I shall dwell further on.

I must now discuss the question in detail.

As regards the geographical names occurring in the Avesta, I must refer to the list of mountains given in Yasht, XIX 11 *seq.* It is to some extent of no value, since their exact position cannot be assigned to these mountains. With the help of the Bundelesh some information can be gathered concerning the following names. The *Ushidāo* and the *Ushidarna* stand in Segestān, and therefore in Eastern Irān, as does also *Upāri-saina*.¹ The *Antar-kangha* and *Sichindava* are to be looked for in Kandiz, i.e., on the frontier between Irān and China; *Syamaka* and *Vafraka* in Kābul. *Raiva* lies in Khorāsān and near it stand *Spentodhāta* and *Kadrva-aspa*, which according to the Bundelesh, are situated near Tus (Meshed). Only the *Asnavāo* is situated in Ātropātene. Of the other mountains mentioned, the *Arzura*, *Mainakha*, *Vāti-gaisa*, and *Taira*, are well-known, and to these I shall revert further on. Finally, we must mention *Kaurisa*, which is supposed by the Vedas to be situated in Irān.

To the geographical statements of the Bundelesh I attach little importance, since it sets up a world-system of which no trace is to be found in the Avesta. Nevertheless, if we rely on its authority, all those mountains, the geographical positions of which we can trace with its help, must be in Eastern Irān, with the single exception of the Asnavant.

The following are the other geographical names occurring in the Avesta : —*Aryana-vaija* ; the rivers *Dātya* and *Darja* ; *Sughdha* and *Gava* ; *Qārizem* ; the rivers *Rangha* (with the *Gaudha* or *Gudha*) and *Ardevisura-Anāhita* ; the mountains *Hara-berzati* with the *Taira* and *Hukarya* ; *Kangha*, *Vaiska*, and *Khshathrō-sauka* ; the lake *Voru-kasha* ; *Moru* ; *Bākhdi* ; *Nisaya* ; *Haraiva* (*Vāti-gaisa*) ; *Vaikerta* ; *Urva* ; *Harahvati* ; *Haitumat* ; *Vehrkāna* (*Khnenla*) ; *Varna Chakhra* ; *Ragha* ; *Pisina* ; *Hapta-hindavo* ; the lakes *Kansu*, *Chaicha-sta*, *Frazdānava*, *Husrava*, *Vanghazda*, and *Awzhdānava*, and the mountains *Ushida* and *Ushidarna*, *Arzura*, *Mainakha*, and *Erzifya*, and also the river *Vitanghvati*.

I need not here mention again Bawri and Kvirinta, since I have already stated my opinion regarding them ; as also Ishkata and Poruta. Of Ragha, too, I have spoken already. Here the point in question only refers to those parts of Eastern Irān over which the Avesta people extended themselves. Chakhra and Varna mark the period of transition and are to be sought for, according to general belief, in Tāberistān. If, apart from this district, Eastern Irān was the scene of the civilization of the Avesta, are we not then amply justified in speaking of an Eastern Irānian civilization ?

We may still further simplify our task. We may pass over the names Vanghazda, Awzhdānava, and Vitanghvati, as there is no means whatever of

¹ Cf. West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. pp. 36-37 note.

forming an opinion as to their situation. The same may also be said of the mountains Mainakha, Erzifya, and Arzūra. The Aryana-vaija forms a group with the Dātya and Darja. Therefore, wherever the latter were situated the Aryana-vaija must have been near them, and its position is never distinctly described; but the description includes that of the Dātya and Darja. The same is the case with the Kangha, Vaiska, Khshathrō-sauka, and Hara-berzati which includes the Taira and Hukarya. Again the Sughdha and Gava, the Vehrkāna and Khnenta form one group.

The Rangha, the Ardvi-sura, and the Voru-kasha, are generally considered by my critics to be mythical places, and, as far as I know, no one has been able with any certainty to locate them in Western Irān. Therefore, they are also useless for purposes of evidence.¹

As regards the remaining names, nine of them belong indisputably to localities in Eastern Irān (Sughdha, Qārizem, Moru, Bākhdhi, Haraiva, Harahvati, Haitumat, Vehrkāna, Pisina), since they exist there to the present day. The remaining eight, namely, Nisaya, Vāti-gaisa, Vaikerta, Urva, Hapta-hindavō, Kansu, and the mountains Ushida and Ushidarna,² are now generally recognized, even by my opponents, as having been situated in Eastern Irān. On four of the names or groups of names (Aryana-vaija, Haraberzati, Kangha, Frazdānava), no unanimous decision has yet been arrived at; nevertheless most writers, at least in the case of the two last mentioned, are inclined to locate them in Eastern Irān. Only two localities viz., the Lakes Chaichasta and Husrava are looked for in Western Irān, and this without any definite reason.

He must be very hard to satisfy who is not convinced by the arguments set forth above. In my opinion they point so decidedly to Eastern Irān as the home of the Avesta people that further confirmation seems hardly necessary. Nevertheless, I hope to be able to prove that Aryana-vaija and Haraberzati should be sought in the East, or at least to show the insufficiency of the arguments on which the theory of their situation in the West is based. Lake Chaichasta we must deal with later on.

In the first place, as regards Frazdānava, no one has as yet assigned it to Western Irān, but the whole testimony of tradition agrees in locating it in

¹ In my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," pp. 132 *seq.* and pp. 139 *seq.*, I have explained the theory of the Rangha being the Jaxartes (Syr-daryā), the Ardvisura the Oxus (Amu-daryā), and the Voru-kasha Lake Aral or the Caspian Sea. Besides, this view is also shared by others.

² Doubts might certainly be raised as to the district of Nisaya, which means only "a settlement," nevertheless we have a passage in the Vendidad (I. 8), where its situation is described. Cf. also M. Tomaschek, *Ausland*, 1883, pp. 822-823.

the Eastern province.¹ Dr. Spiegel's latest remark on the subject is indeed somewhat diffident :— "Frazdānu or Frazdānava is, according to the Bunde-hesh, a lake in Segestān ; but M. Lagarde has (not unreasonably) traced its name in that of the Armenian river Hrazdan, *which is possibly correct*.
"² Every one will surely allow that the similarity between an A r m e n i a n and an I r ā n i a n name proves nothing at all as regards the identity of the places named, but rather renders such identity improbable. The Avesta mentions a river Haravati and the Rig-veda a Sarasvati, but no one will venture to assert that these rivers were, therefore, identical.

Until quite recently, no difference of opinion existed concerning Kangha, Vaiska, and Khshathrō-sauka. The Avesta places Kangha evidently in Tūrān,³ which is always understood to be the country north of the Oxus. The testimony of the Bunde-hesh, the Minokhired, and of the "Book of Kings" by Firdūsī, agrees with that of the Avesta. Kangha is always referred to as a district in the far North-East. *Here we surely have a firm footing, which we should not fail to make good*, unless we wish to cut away the ground from under our own feet. And yet Dr. Spiegel starts a theory that Kangha was in the West, (Sp. I, p. 20) ; but apparently without any authority, and in direct opposition to the evidence of tradition which he at other times values so highly. His line of argument runs as follows :—Kangha was the home of the Hunus, the enemies of Vishtāspa. The Hyvaunas and the Vardhakas appear elsewhere in the Avesta as the foes of Vishtāspa. The latter may be identified with the Chionitae and Vartae, who dwelt on the western shores of the Caspian. But this is not possible, if Eastern and not Western Irān was the scene of Vishtāspa's career. So Dr. Spiegel thinks fit to locate Kangha, too, in the West and to look there also for the Hunus, though at the same time acknowledging that "there is much evidence to show that it was in Eastern Irān," adding, however, "but the possibility always remains, that there were Hunus also on the western shores of the Caspian."

But Dr. Spiegel, who laboured after a "historical" explanation of the Avesta with so much determination and achieved his object with so much success, makes the following statement :— "The fact ought to be admitted that, as far as we can gather from native sources, Kangha was situated in the East." He ought

¹ Cf. especially *Bahman-yasht*, ch. III. 13, West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 220. Aūharmazd spoke thus : "O Zaratūst the Spitāmān, when the demon with dishevelled hair, of the race of wrath, comes into notice in the Eastern quarter, first a black token becomes manifest, and Hūshādūr, son of Zaratūst, is born near lake Frazdān." Again, Bunde-hesh, ch. XXII. 5 (*ibid.* p. 86).

² Vide Sp. I, p. 17 : "Das Wasser Frazdānu oder Frazdānava ist nach dem Bunde-hesh ein See in Segestān ; allein dasselbe Wort hat Lagarde mit Recht im Namen des Armenischen Flusses Hrazdan erkannt, an den man auch denken kann."

³ Yt. V. 53-54, 57-58. Cf. O.K.A. pp. 52-54, 198-199. Windischmann, Bréal, Justi, De Harlez, are all agreed in locating Kanga in the East.

certainly not to have sacrificed this fact for the sake of etymology. If it will not agree with the Chionitae, well and good; we must not try to identify the Hvyauuas with the latter, or else we must concede that Vishtāspa's activity extended to Eastern as well as to Western Irān. Can we not with justice use Dr. Spiegel's own words :—"The possibility remains that there were Hvyauuas (Chionitae) also on the western shores of the Caspian"?

Let us now consider the Chionitae and Vartae, whom Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 1, pp. 16 *seq.*) would identify with the *Hvyauua* and the *Voredhaka* of the Avesta. The identity is purely etymological and not historical. Does the identity of peoples follow from the identity of their names? The Mardoi, for instance, are said to have lived both in Persia and Hyrcania, and the Daai on the eastern shores of the Caspian, but at the same time beyond the Tanais-Jaxartes and in Persia.¹ Is it not rather probable that this similarity of names is only apparent? Even in external form the two words *Vardhaya* and *Vartae* are not alike. Dr. Spiegel² derives the word *Hvyauua* or *Hyauna* from the *haēna* of the Avesta and from the Middle Irānian word *hayūn*. Dr. Geldner,³ on the contrary, is of opinion that the word should be derived from *hva-yauna*, meaning "one who goes his way, a wanderer, a vagabond." According to him it is not generally a proper, but a generic name. If this etymology be correct—and the passages in the Avesta seem to support it—then the identification of the Chionitae with the Hvyauua loses all value as historical evidence.⁴

But, now what do we know of the Chionitae? Ammianus says of them :—"*Datiano et Cereali consulibus cum universa per Gallias studio cautiore dis-
ponerentur formidoque praeteritorum barbaricos hebetaret excursus rex Persa-
rum in confinis adhuc gentium extimarum, iamque cum Chionitis et Gelanis
omnium acerrimis bellatoribus pigmore icto societatis rediturus ad sua, Tamsa-
poris scripta suscepit, pacem Romanum principem nuntiantis poscere preca-
tivum.*" (17. 5. 1.)

If we add to this another passage from Ammianus (18. 6. 22),⁵ to which Dr. Spiegel does not refer and wherein Grumbates, the king of the Chionitae,

¹ Cf. Supra, pp. 135-137, O.K.A. pp. 203-204, 200-201.

² Dr. Spiegel's reference to the *hayūn rūi* in Firdūsī, which might be explained by the change of meaning from the Old Irānian *haēna* to the Middle Irānian *hayun*, is very ingenious. But the Syriac *hreenai* with its initial *hr* does not entirely suit this interpretation.

³ *Avestāstudien*, p. 83.

⁴ Spiegel's etymology of the names, Chionitae and Hvyauua, might of itself mark them as generic terms. As such *haēna* is often enough employed in the Avesta, (*vide* Supra, pp. 128-129; O.K.A. pp. 191-192.)

⁵ [Dr. Geiger here alters the wording of the passage (p. 329, ll. 6—18) as follows :—

"Fügen wir zu dieser Stelle eine *andzre* (Amm. 18. 6. 22), deren Spiegel nicht gedenkt, und in welcher der Chionitenkönig Grumbates neben dem König der Albaner genannt wird, so ist das alles, was wir von den Chioniten wissen. Durch ihre Zusammenstellung mit den Gelanen, unter denen wohl zweifellos die Bewohner von Gilan zu verstehen sind, und mit den

is mentioned with the king of Albania, we have the sum total of our knowledge of the Chionitae. From the latter being named with the Gelans, who must of course be understood to be the inhabitants of Gilan, and with the Albanians. It is indeed more probable that they dwelt on the western shores of the Caspian. On such an uncertain basis, or at all events on the mere identification of the names Hvyauana and Chionitae, does Dr. Spiegel ground his theory that Vishtāspa had his home in the West. Again, from the words, "This conquest of two nations¹ by Vishtāspa, in which Shapur II, was concerned....." we gather that he assigns the origin of the Vishtāspa legend to the reign of King Shapur or still later. Now what can be his object in thus connecting it with Shapur? By so doing he deprives his argument of the last vestige of evidence. At least he cannot venture to assert that the original Avesta was written in the fourth century after Christ! If so, his conclusion would amount to this:—"The Vishtāspa legends of the Avesta bear a striking resemblance to the history of Shapur II., therefore, they are productions of that time."² Thus, then, they would lose all value as evidence for determining the home of the Avesta people and the antiquity of their civilization; and we should have gathered only one argument in proof of the spuriousness [?] of a portion of the book, especially of the passages quoted by Dr. Spiegel from the Yashts.

Accordingly, the theatre of Vishtāspa's wars was in the East; in the East we must endeavour to find the country of Kangha; and it was in the East that he fought with the Hvyauanas and Vardhakas, and, likewise, with the Huns. With regard to the latter I am inclined to draw attention to a paper of M. Tomaschek's (*Ausland*, 1883. vol. LVI. p. 824), according to which the Finish accounts of the invasions of the Northern Hiün-yo from the Gobi date back to 1750 B. C. The mention made of them in the Avesta strengthen rather than weakens the claims of that book to a high antiquity.³

Albanern wird allerdings wahrscheinlich gemacht, dass sie im Westen des Kaspischen Meeres wohnten. Auf diese unsichere Basis und auf die jedenfalls nur hypothetische Vergleichung der Namen Hvyauana und Chionitae baut Spiegel seine Annahme, dass Vischtāspa im Westen gewohnt habe."

¹ "Diese Besiegung zweier Völker durch Vischtāspa, mit welchen Schāpūr II. zu thun hatte....." The second nation refers doubtless to the Vertae of Ammianus, i.e., the Vardhaka, but as far as I know we have no authority for supposing a conquest of the Vertae by Shapur; on the contrary, they appear to have been allies of the Persians (Amm. 19.2.3).

² "Die Sagen über Vischtāspa im Avestā zeigen eine auffallende Ähnlichkeit mit der Geschichte Schāpūrs II. Sie sind also ein Machwerk aus dieser Zeit."

³ As, for instance, Justi, (J. I. Sp. 1476), has done: "He hesitates to recognize this people (the Huns) in the Hunu, because they belong to a time more modern than the writing of the Avesta;" he should rather have concluded that the passage, in which the Huns are mentioned, was of comparatively recent insertion. In my opinion Tomaschek has now arrived at the right conclusion, and dispelled my doubts.

If, in the last few pages I have been now and then compelled to digress into matter that pertains to the second part of my treatise, I shall now confine myself to purely geographical questions in discussing the Hara-berzati.

I believe I may refer, in entering upon this subject, principally to my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," (pp. 137-140, *supra*), in which I locate that mountain-range in the East, since the Avesta itself does so. When the Avesta says of Mithra, that he rises before the sun, as well as the moon and the stars over the Hara-berzati, it clearly proves that, for the author of such a passage, the Hara-berzati must have been situated in the East.¹ It is, therefore, impossible to identify that range with the Alburz mountains, lying on the southern shores of the Caspian, in spite of their names being identical. The Alburz lay exactly to the West as regarded Moru and Bākhdi, &c., and to the North with respect to the inhabitants of Ragha; but never with regard to any of the territories, in the East or South-East, mentioned in the Avesta.

Facts point the other way. I believe Hara-berzati to have been more than a local name. To such a range of mountains as those mentioned above it is quite suited on account of its general meaning of "High Mountains." The conjecture is also confirmed by the fact that the name was not merely confined to the Alburz of the Caspian, but extended also to the Caucasus. The name Alburzond given by the Ossetes to the Elbrus, is evidently the same old Avesta word.

Since we have found the name Hara-berzati applied to two quite distinct mountain-ranges, may it not possibly have belonged likewise to a third? In the last we must, of course, recognize the great central highland of Asia, the Pāmir, the Thianshan, and the Alai, which must have seemed to the Irānians of the Avesta to coincide exactly with the eastern boundary of their world.

Finally, we come to Aryana-vaija and the rivers Dātya and Darja.

It is now, I believe, generally agreed that Aryana-vaija is known to the Avesta itself only as a semi-mythical land. This I have never denied; on the contrary, I have laid some stress upon it.² Hence two results may be de-

¹ Again, it necessarily follows hence that the important part played by the Alburz in the world-system of the Bundelesh, is entirely unknown to the Avesta.

² Cf. my *O. K. A.* p. 30: "As to the Irānians of the Avesta, Aryana-vaija had already, so far as they were concerned, passed out of the domain of history into the region of legend." Cf. also p. 32, where the reasons are given for its having been chosen by the Avesta as the home and dwelling of Zoroaster. Like Ahura Mazda and Yima he is called *srūtō-airy nē-vaijahi*, (Ys. IX. 14); and the place of his birth is pointed out on the Darja, (Vd. XIX. 4. 11), where the house of his father Porushaspa stood. Zarathushtra, therefore, belonged to the East, if, as I hope to be able to prove, Aryana-vaija must be assigned to that quarter. We need not be hampered by the comparatively modern evidence to the contrary. All the best Occidental testimony also goes to prove that Eastern Irān was the

duced :—firstly, that from the references to Aryana-vaija we must draw no elaborate historical conclusions ; secondly, that it must have been a country beyond the true frontiers of the Irānian people, known to them more by tradition, verbal or written, than by personal experience, bearing almost the same relation to them as the *Rusā* did to the Arians of the Rig-veda. We must satisfy ourselves, therefore, with a somewhat general indication of the situation of Aryana-vaija.

The semi-mythical character of Aryana-vaija is revealed by the fact that in the Avesta it is reputed to be the home of Ahura Mazda.¹ There he makes known to Anāhita his will that Zarathushtra shall remain faithful to Him, and think, speak, and act according to His commandments. There, too, Ahura Mazda holds his meeting with the legendary king Yima ; and Zarathushtra is likewise spoken of as the “renowned one in the country of Aryana, vaija.”²

The Avesta is, and must always remain, the earliest source of information, and it is a help to us in ascertaining the position of Aryana-vaija ; and here again we have to consider the evidence afforded by the register of countries in the Vendidad. If the antiquity of the register is disputed, at any rate no one will deny that it is of earlier date than the traditional Parsee writings, than the Bundeshesh or the Minokhired ; and at the time of its translation it was even regarded as an integral portion of the Parsee Scriptures and was translated, commented on, and interpreted in the same way as every other fragment of the great Avesta.

Again in Vd. I. 3 we find :—

“As the first of the lands and as the best dwelling-place, I, Ahura Mazda, created the *Aryana-vaija* (the country) situated on the good Dātya. Thereupon Angra Manyu, who is full of death, counter-created the water-serpents and a winter produced by the demons.”

From this we gather two conclusions :—that Aryana-vaija was on the Dātya, and that it suffered from very severe winters. But more important

home of Zoroaster. “By far the majority of the old writers, moreover, describe Zoroaster as a Bactrian. If against their statements it should be remarked that they are all modern, we might respond by saying that the accounts which call Zoroaster a Mede, are proved to be still later and less numerous.” (Sp. 1, p. 3.)

¹ [This fact does not necessarily prove the admixture of any mythical element in the Avesta description of Aryana-vaija ; it rather confirms the Zoroastrian belief that the primitive land of the early *Mazdayasna* was the abode of all piety and blessings, where man was himself a spiritual power exulting in the glorification of the divine government, and, inspired, with supernatural thoughts, was, in the moments of intense devotion, in communion with the Creator and the good genii. *Tr. n.*]

² Yt. V. 17-18 ; cf. Yt. XV. 2 ; Vd. II. 21 ; Ys. IX. 14. Hauma, too, offers up his prayer to Anāhita in Aryana-vaija. (Yt. V. 104).

still is the order in which the countries are enumerated in the Vendidad and the positions which each of them holds. Aryana-vaija heads the list, and is followed by Sughdha, Moru, Bākhdi, Nisaya, Haraiva, indisputably following the course from North to South. Hence it follows almost certainly that Aryana-vaija was further North than Sughdha. No objection can, therefore, be taken, *if we locate it in Upper Ferghanāh*.¹

But, then, is this supposition at variance with the rest of the evidence afforded by the Avesta? By no means. I have collected all the passages in which Aryana-vaija is mentioned, *but in none* (with the exception of Vd. I. 4) *is there any direct evidence as to the situation of that country*. Hence I cannot find any warrant for what Dr. Justi says: "Other traditions of the Avesta and of more modern works *positively locate in the West* the primitive land of the Avesta people, and thus probably also the home of Zoroaster."² As far as Aryana-vaija and the Avesta are concerned, it is an assertion without any convincing evidence.

Again, the Avesta never alludes to the geographical situation of the Dātya. We only know that on its banks Zari-vari and Vishtāspa offered their prayers for success in battle.³ Besides, it is only mentioned in the register of countries side by side with Aryana-vaija.

But, now, what has led Dr. Justi⁴ to identify *Aryana-vaija with the country of Arran on the Lower Araxes near Ātropātene*? A passage in the Bundelesh,

¹ Even Justi is forced to admit that Aryana-vaija is represented by the Vendidad as the country furthest to the North-East (J. 1, Sp. 1473), and I have as yet never come across any attempt to account for the extraordinary interpretation of the sequence in the register, which would be necessary if we were to identify Aryana-vaija with Arran! I might once more refer to the attempt I have made in my *O. K. A.* pp. 3-6, 76-78, to explain this order of names, which has met with the approval of Dr. E. W. West, who says: "It appears from these details (given by Dr. Geiger) which are illustrated by a carefully-drawn map of the whole region described, that the apparent irregularities in the arrangement of the names of these lands are quite consistent with the assumption that they are mentioned in the order in which their inhabitants accepted the Avesta religion. And as half the names are readily identified with the names of places mentioned by Darius in his Cuneiform Inscriptions, or by Greek writers, and still in use, it seems most probable that the other half are also old names of lands still existing on the earth's surface, and are mythic only in so far as our present knowledge is insufficient to identify them with absolute certainty." (*Vide the Indian Antiquary*, Dec., 1882, pp. 349-350). It is proper to plead simply the geographical ignorance of the author. How is it then possible that we can attach importance to the very regular sequence in isolated groups?

² "Sonstige Ueberlieferungen im Awestā und in jüngeren Werken verlegen das Urland (unächst wohl das Vaterland des Zoroaster) bestimmt in den Westen."

³ Yt. V. 112 : IX, 29; In the same way, the two passages in the Avesta in which the Darja is mentioned (Vd. XIX, 4 and 11), are of less value in determining its distinct geographical situation.

⁴ *Beiträge zur alten Geographie Persiens*, "Contributions to the Geography of Ancient Persia," p. 18.

which says : "Aīrān-vēj lies at the side of Atrōpaṭkān."¹ He professes to find this confirmed by another passage : "The Dāitīk river (Dātya) rises in Aīrān-vēj and flows through Gurjistān (Georgia)." But Gurjistān is simply a conjecture of his own, elegant though it may be. The latest translator, Dr. West, retains the manuscript reading, which is simply an inaccuracy in the Pāzand transcription of the word meaning generally "mountain-land" (Kohistān).² Nor should any importance be attached to the name Arrān. The ancient *Airyana* corresponds rather with the Middle and Modern Irānian *Ērān* or *Irān* than with *Arrān*. Only compare *Airyaman* of the Avesta with the Pahlavi and Modern Persian *Ērmān*.

Accordingly, I have set the scattered references of the Bundeshesh side by side with the Avesta, and I do not think that it will be difficult to decide between the two.³ Here I may remark that the obscurity of the statements of the Bundeshesh with regard to Aryana-vaija and the country belonging to it, may also be proved. That the Vara of Yima was situated close to Aryana-vaija is shown by the second chapter of the Vendidad and expressed in clear words in the sixty-second chapter (pāra. 15) of the Minokhired.⁴ Yet the Bundeshesh locates it in Pars.⁵

But our view is further confirmed by the fact that the Minokhired,⁶ which is at least not less trustworthy than the Bundeshesh, looks for Aryana-vaija in the East, and locates it on the borders of Kandiz, which belongs to the "country of the East," and which Dr. Justi himself describes as being in the far North-East.

1. Thus we have now arrived at the conclusion that all the geographical testimony of the Avesta points to Eastern Irān, save that Ragha is near the western frontier, and that there is no other place known to the present day, which lay further than Ragha to the West or South-West.

¹ *Bdh.* XXIX. 12 (Justi, p. 70. 10). By-the-by, I must observe that it is impossible that Arrān should have been regarded as a mythical place during the last centuries before Christ, in which, according to the view of my opponent, the Avesta must have been composed; since at that time it lay exactly within the pale of Irānian history and civilization.

² West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 79, note 1.

³ Again, Duncker says (*Gesch. des Alterthums*, vol. IV. p. 24, note 4): "It still appears to me advisable to look for Aryana-vaija in the country lying near the sources of the Oxus."

⁴ [Vide West, "Pahlavi Texts," part III. p. 109, "(12) The spirit of wisdom answered (13) thus: 'Kangdez is entrusted with the eastern quarter, near to Satavāyēs, (14) on the frontier of Aīrān-vēgō.'"] The Minokhired contains no such references to the rule of the Arabians in Persia, as are to be found in the Bundeshesh. Thus the former seems to lay claim to a higher antiquity than the latter.

⁵ *Bdh.* XXIX. 14, (following West's Translation).

⁶ *Mkh.* LXII. 13-14. Here we are only struck by the statement: "Near to Satvēs," since the Star Satavaisa is elsewhere described as the ruler of the West.

We must now turn to Lake Chaichasta. There is no doubt that, according to the Bundehehsh, this lake was situated in Ātropātene, and, therefore, it can only be identified with Lake Urumia.¹ But it might be asked whether we have not here again another instance of the transfer of a name to a later period. Of course this view can be nothing more than a conjecture; but, nevertheless, something may be said in its favour.

It was near Lake Chaichasta, that Frangrasyan (Afrāsiāb) was defeated and taken prisoner by Husrava.² Moreover, that the scene of the struggle between the Irānians and Turānians was the North-Eastern frontier of Irān, can scarcely be disputed. The Oxus forms the boundary between the two kingdoms, and, according as the one or the other gained the supremacy, so Khorāsān on the rivers Kāse and Shehd, Khvārizem (Khīwa), Dighistān, Soghd on the Gulzarriūn, or Kang-bihisht became the scene of conflict. The fact, that at this time the residence of the Irānian kings was placed by Firdūsī in Istakhr or in some other western town, is absolutely unimportant. This would be an anachronism. Here the whole question is only concerning the great opposition between Irān and Tūrān, which occupied all the early legendary epoch, and this hostility found vent in North-Eastern Irān.

We would, therefore, feel inclined to seek Chaichasta in the North-East. Anyhow, we must not admit that the history of the end of Afrāsiāb, related in the "Book of Kings," along with the abovementioned wars, wherein the Tūrānian king was driven to the North-East, appears inconsistent. If the name Chaichasta was transferred to Lake Urumia in the time of Firdūsī, then the story of Afrāsiāb's wanderings and of his discovery is easily explained. The later localizing of this legend on the shores of Lake Urumia, would have necessitated its being brought into harmony for better or for worse, with the other narratives which place the scene of conflict exclusively in the North-East. The conclusion best in accord with the most ancient accounts, and certainly the simplest and most trustworthy one, would be that Afrāsiāb, after he had been driven further and further away by Khosraw, at length fell into the hands of his enemies near Lake Chaichasta.

Is it not possible that it may have been Lake Issyk-kul? This conjecture—for naturally it is nothing more—was suggested to me by M. Tomaschek.³

2. That such a transference of names as I would assume in the case of Lake Chaichasta, occurred in some instances, is not to be disputed. No one

¹ West ("Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 85, note 4), states that Lake Urumia is called Khejest or Chechest by Hamdullāh Mustāfi.

² Yt. IX. 18, 21; XVII. 41. Cf. Yt. V. 49.

³ *Ausland*, 1883, p. 824. In determining the position of Lake Chaichasta we determine also that of Lake Husrava. If the former is the Issyk-kul, the latter is doubtless the Sason-kul. If, on the contrary, the former is Lake Urumia, then the latter must be Lake Van.

will maintain that the Rangha of the Avesta meant the Tigris, and yet this river is meant by the Arang of the Bundelesh. Dr. Spiegel has already directed our attention to the migration of the names, Kur and Araxes. The transference of the name Hara-berzati I have pointed out above. Now the question arises whether, in these cases, a migration from East to West or one from West to East is the more probable. When we consider that we can prove almost to a certainty that all the Indo-Irānian tribes lived in territories lying to the North and South of the Hindu-kush, we may at once admit the fact of a migration of the Irānian names of places westward, concurrently with the extension of that tribe in that direction, just as we may observe a south-easterly advance of Indian names. The theory of a migration of geographical designations from West to East would pre-suppose a perfectly artificial conformation of the many streams of migrating tribes opposed to one another.

3. I would now draw attention to the numerous names of places mentioned in the Avesta. Without exception they all lie within the boundary indicated by the (Avesta) register of countries. None of them, as we have observed, leads us further westwards than Ragha. Can this be a mere accident? Should we then make an exception in the case of Chaichasta, an exception by no means authorized by the Avesta, (which contains no allusion to its geographical position), but only founded on a far later application of the name? Will not this *only* name be overborne, so to speak, by the weight of the rest? Does not the complete picture presented by all the geographical references in the Avesta concerning the home of the ancient Irānians, compel us to place Chaichasta also within the limits of Irān?

Fewer definite results are to be obtained from an examination of the ethnographical statements of the Avesta than by determining the geographical names. Here I may confine myself to a brief recapitulation of what I have already said on the subject in my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," (*vide supra* 1. ch. I. §4, *supra* pp. 130 *seq.*; *O. K. A.* pp. 193 *seq.*)

I have already observed that the reference to the Hunus points to Central Asia and not to Western Irān. Similarly, I have discussed the names, Hvyāuna and Vardhaka. Again, we must look for the Tūra in Central Asia, since the Oxus is actually mentioned as the boundary between their territory and that of the Irānians. The Dāhas, too, were divided from the Irānians by the Oxus. Indeed, Herodotus mentions a tribe of the Daai as inhabiting Persis, as well as the Mardoi and Sajatæ. Moreover, we must assign the country of this nomadic tribe to the eastern shores of the Caspian, that is to say, the land of the Turcomans of the present day. Here their name is also

preserved in the Middle Irānian expression *Dāhistān*.¹ Little need be said regarding the Sarima and the Sāni, since neither word seems to be a proper name, but rather a generic term. Thus Sarima might be traced in the modern Sarmatia without justifying any supposition as regards an identity or relationship between the two tribes. I would adhere to my explanation of *Maredha*=the Mardoi and *Drivika*=the Derbikes, although Dr. Justi opposes this view. Again, the identification of *Barvara* with the appellation *Barbar* for the Hindu-kush tribes is not quite improbable. However, from these names we cannot infer anything that will help us to determine the home of the Avesta, as they are invariably spoken of as the plague of special districts, *viz.*, Moru, Haraiva and Bākhdi.²

We must now turn to the question of the age of the Avesta.

§ 8. *On the Age of the Avesta.*

I.

We begin with a *documentum e silentio*.² The Avesta must have been in existence in a pre-Achaemenian, most probably in a pre-Median epoch. I.—Because the Avesta does not speak of any of the towns famous during the latter period, with the exception of Ragha, the high antiquity of which is thereby established. II.—The Avesta does not mention any of the names of nations that were commonly known at a later period. Neither does it allude to the Persians, Parthians, nor Medes, but simply to the Arians. III.—The Avesta contains no historical statement concerning the battles between the Medes and the Babylonians, the rise of the Persians, the prosperity and downfall of the Persian empire under the Achaemenian dynasty, the invasion of Alexander the Great, which agitated and reorganized the whole of the Orient, the states which rose on the ruins of the empire of Alexander, and the dominion of the Arsacidae.

Who will believe that a work so copious as the Avesta could thus ignore all contemporary (or antecedent) events and circumstances? This would be conceivable, if it were merely a book of laws and ritual. But the Avesta frequently treats even of external events. It speaks of the inroads of hostile troops. The Yashts describe the battles waged with foreign nations. Attention is constantly drawn to the national antagonism between Arians and non-Arians, and likewise to the economic antagonism between the nomads and the agriculturists. The tribal constitution pre-eminently appears from the testimony of the Avesta. Princes ruling over the separate districts and particularly powerful personages unite the different Arian kingdoms under

¹ Besides, the word *Dāha* meaning simply "enemy" may well have been applied to quite different races.

² Vd. I, 6, 9, 7.

their own sovereignty--of whom Kavi-Husrava is especially remarkable. Is it possible that there could have been not even a single event of sufficient importance to induce the writers of the Avesta to make mention of kings among the Achaemenidae or the Arsacidæ, who possessed still greater power ?¹

One can search the Avesta through and through, without finding a single statement to which all that we possess of Irānian history would give a clue. What is more natural than the assumption that it dates from a time in which there was no other trustworthy history of Irān. *As a matter of fact by such a supposition, I think, much less is imposed upon our "faith" than by the assertion that this utter absence of historical allusion is purely "accidental."*

Such an accident is quite incredible, indeed, if we regard Western Irān as the home of the Avesta ; but it is equally inconceivable if we place it in Eastern Irān. Read, for instance, Prof. Max Duncker's Outlines of the History of the Kingdom of Bactria² at the time of the Achaemenidae and of the Greco-Bactrian Princes :— " At no time was the Eastern part of the kingdom so shut off and isolated that it would have remained untouched by events passing round it."

Dr. Spiegel writes :— " Following the example of Prof. Rhode, it (*i.e.* the first Fargard of the Vendidad) has often been compared with the list of tribes in Genesis ; and, as a proof of its great antiquity, the fact has been adduced of the absence in the Vendidad of the name Ekbatana, which, therefore, was probably not built when the Fargard was written. This is surely a proof of a peculiar nature. May we not equally well conclude that Ekbatana had already lost its early importance."³ The proof would be singular, indeed, if it were confined to Ekbatana. But the question here refers, not merely to the Median capital, but also to all the important towns which were famous after the Median period. Not only is Ekbatana ignored but also Susa, Pasargadae, Persepolis, Istakhr, Hecatompylos and Seleucia. The several Alexandrias and such towns as Markanda, Cyropolis, &c., are not even once mentioned. How significant, therefore, is

¹ I have here only recapitulated, in order not to repeat myself, the several points which I have already treated at length in my *Ostiranische Kultur*, pp. 176-210, pp. 425 seq.; (*supra* pp. 116-141 ; pp. 279 seq.)

² *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. IV. pp. 15 seq.

³ " *Nicht selten wird derselbe (der erste Fargard des Vendidad) nach dem Vorgange Rhodes mit der Völkertafel der Genesis verglichen und als Beweis für sein hohes Alterthum der Umstand angeführt, dass Ekbatana nicht genannt werde und daher noch nicht gebaut gewesen sei als jener Fargard geschrieben wurde. Dieser Beweis ist seltsam, man kann ebensogut daraus schliessen, dass Ekbatana damals seine frühere Bedeutung schon eingebüsst hatte.*" (Sp. 2, p. 640). Against Dr. Spiegel's remarks on Ekbatana, it must also be observed that this city was not only powerful and famous in antiquity, but that its historical importance continued unimpaired from olden times throughout the Middle Ages, and survived more or less down to the last century of our era.

the fact that, of all the cities of the West, only ancient Babylon is named in the Avesta ! The renown of that powerful city spread even to the rugged highlands of Eastern Irān.

To the second reason also, which I have adduced in proof of the great antiquity of the Avesta--namely, the absence of all names of nations, such as Medes, Persians, Parthians, &c.,--we may attach no small importance, since they are in fact the names by which the Irānian races were universally known in historical times. It must seem doubly striking to those who endeavour to identify the Āthravans of the Avesta with the Magi of the Medes ; for the religious and political conflict between the latter and the other tribes belonging to the Irānian empire, particularly the Persians, must inevitably have caused that name to be mentioned at least once. Let us see what evidence Herodotus furnishes and consider the passage in which he says : " The Medes were also called Arians." Even this statement supports my argument. It runs as follows : ἐχχλέοντο δὲ πάλλι πρὸς πάντων Ἀριοι. Thus in πάλλι they were called "Arians." In the time of Herodotus, *i.e.*, in the fifth century B. C., the name was already antiquated, or at least its use was restricted. In the Avesta, on the contrary, *airya* is the only recognized and universal designation of the people.¹

It must not, however, be inferred that by the name "Arian" the Avesta people are brought into close connection with the Arians of the Rig-veda. In the case of the latter also, and especially in all ancient writings, the name Ārya is an ethnographical designation, which, in later times, when the conquest of the habitable territory was finally accomplished, sank to the level of a mere class-name comprising the members of the three higher castes. In Irān, likewise, we find the name Ārya used only in the Avesta ; but in later times, when the original nation had broken up into distinct tribes, the name entirely disappeared, giving place to the names of individual tribes.

In endeavouring to find positive proofs of the great age of the Avesta, we must look chiefly to internal evidence.

Here I refer principally to the economic conditions of the Avesta people, a feature of their civilized life to which I have devoted particular attention in my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," but which unfortunately has not as yet been sufficiently studied.

The existence, at every period of history, in Irān, and particularly in Eastern Irān, of nomadic tribes, side by side with those who pursued agriculture, and the continuance of this discordant feature down to the present day, are explained by the nature of the country. We need not, therefore, deduce the great age of the Avesta from the traces of nomadic life we may find in it.

¹ Cf. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 168-169 ; *supra* pp. 111-112.

But the fact assumes quite a different aspect, when the Avesta takes us back to a period, wherein parts or sections of the people in general make a first attempt to change their wandering life for a settled one, to a period in which the discordant element, which afterwards became historical, makes its first appearance. It makes an immense difference whether primitive economic conditions appear only incidentally or whether they occupy the whole life and form the highest and essential interests of the people ; whether, in short, religious and economic reforms go hand in hand.

I would here ask those who seek to identify the *Āthravans* of the Avesta with the *Magi* of the Achaemenian and pre-Achaemenian periods, whether they can discover in those periods that warm interest on the part of the priests in agricultural matters, that eager support and encouragement of agriculture and cattle-breeding which are so prominently displayed in the Avesta ? For my part, I cannot imagine such a thing ; for it hardly seems possible that, at a time when political feeling and party spirit ran so high, the *Magi* should have earnestly busied themselves with the laying out of fields, the planting of trees, and the digging of wells and canals. If we bear in mind the intrigues with which they were concerned after the death of Cambyses, we can no longer recognize in them the spirit of a simple and homely tribe of herdsmen and peasants, such as are the people described in the Avesta, which we are asked to regard as the Sacred Code of these very *Magi* !

This matter, however, requires to be somewhat more closely studied, in connection with the highly important question of the age of the *Gāthās* and the relation they bear to the rest of the Avesta.

II.

While I hold the *Gāthās* to be by far the oldest part of the Avesta, I do not entirely ground my belief upon the evidence of their language. Although it bears many marks of great antiquity, still it is not quite free from later and more polished forms of expression. Again, the language of the *Gāthās* is essentially a distinct dialect, the difference of which from that of the rest of the Avesta may be easily explained by its having belonged to a different country.

Nor do I lay stress upon the fact that the *Gāthās* are quoted in other parts of the Avesta ; for those quotations may, as I believe, have been inserted in later revisions. They testify more to the great reputation than to the great age of these sacred hymns. At the same time it is not improbable that their reputation may have been due to their priority in point of time.

This assumption is corroborated by another fact. The metre of the *Gāthās*, although not so simple as that of the later books of the Avesta, has evidently remained comparatively undisturbed. Like the rest of the *Yasna*, the *Gāthās* have not during their revision been, so to say, remodelled ; they

were rather inserted in the Avesta as a book complete in itself. The Vendidad was handled in the same way, but was at first somewhat violently recast and varied with copious insertions. Evidently, therefore, the Gāthās were considered as more sacred than the Vendidad; the reason of which was probably that they were attributed to Zarathushtra himself or his immediate disciples. There must have been some ground for such a belief. I am not quite ready to accept the theory entirely as it stands; however, it has always appeared to me to bear some marks of probability.¹

We have more valuable evidence of the age of the Gāthās, in the fact that the personages who speak and act in them appear as the contemporaries of the poet, whilst in the rest of the Avesta they are represented as belonging to a remote past. I do not know why this feature has been so long ignored. This circumstance, which gives, so to speak, its present and actual character to the Gāthās, constitutes the chief difference between them and the other parts of the Avesta, and necessitates the theory of a great difference in age.

For instance, Zarathushtra is addressed in person in the passage, (Ys. XLVI. 14) :—

“ O Zarathushtra, who is thy pious friend
In thy great work ? Who is it, that wishes to announce it ?
It is he himself Kavi Vishtāspa, the armed-for-battle,
And whomsoever, O Ahura Mazda, Thou choosest from the settlers :
Them will I extol with the holy sayings of the pious mind.”

And Zarathushtra himself utters the words, (Ys. XLVI. 19) :—

“ Whoever in piety shows me truly good deeds,
To me, Zarathushtra, to him shall be granted
As a reward yonder next world, of all worlds the most worthy to be
aspired to.”

In a similar manner Frasha-ushttra, (Ys. XLVI. 16) and Jāmāspa, (Ys. XLVI. 17 ; XLIX, 9), who belong to the race of the Hvogvids, are personally addressed in the Gāthās. In other passages Frasha-ushttra or Vishtāspa is placed side by side with the poet who says : “ To Vishtāspa and to me,” “ For Frasha-ushttra and also for me.” (Ys. XXVIII. 8 and 9 ; Ys. XLIX. 8 ; cf. also, Ys. LI. 16-18). Likewise, Poruchista, the daughter of Zarathushtra, is personally addressed (Ys. LIII. 3.).

¹ Let me quote a remark of Dr. Justi, (J. I. Sp. 1479) :—“ *so machen bei dem Verfasser, der doch sonst methodisch zu Werke geht, solche Anwendungen von sympathie mit der Gāthā forschung des sel. Haug einen sonderbaren Eindruck.*” “ This keen sympathy with the Gāthā investigations of the deceased Dr. Haug, from an author generally so methodical, is strange enough.” If this is meant as a reproach, I accept it gladly. I must not deny that Dr. Haug is often too subjective, but for our knowledge of the right way to comprehend the Gāthās, we are much indebted to him. I am only sorry that I did not know it sooner ! As an instance of my sympathy with Dr. Haug, Dr. Justi should certainly not have quoted the comparison of *shkyaoma* with the Indian *soma*, since I have utterly declined to endorse it.

This personal character is common to all the Gāthās. They seldom refer to Zarathushtra's work as a reformer. The poet mostly explains his own views, himself reveals the truth of his religion to the people and utters maxims of worldly wisdom or biology. The teaching of Zoroaster does not yet appear as a complete creed, but it is in course of forming and developing. The poet also frequently dwells upon the events—of which I shall speak further on—passing around him, as, for instance, the persecution of the Zoroastrian community.

It is, I believe, incorrect to suppose that in the Gāthās we have only to deal with purely imaginary personages who utter or listen to the words of the Prophet. Why should we make such an assumption only regarding the Gāthās and not the rest of the Avesta? The former are subjective poems, the latter on the contrary is merely a later compilation, wherein we only meet with the words of Zarathushtra and his teaching as quoted on his authority.

I now come to the main point.

Whoever studies the historical and economical conditions of the old Irānian people, as they are described in the Gāthās and in the other parts of the Avesta, must necessarily perceive that a substantial difference existed between the two. This has been already pointed out by me; but it is necessary that I should do so here again, as hitherto all the facts have not been entirely considered.¹

In the Gāthās the cow is the central object of Irānian economy. How important a part this animal plays in the sacred hymns, every one knows who has read even a few lines of them. This can only be satisfactorily explained by assuming that the cow probably was esteemed and cared for by the Irānian people in the age of the Gāthās, just as it was by the Arians of the Rig-veda, and that great and special attention was paid to its breeding and rearing.²

The fruits of agriculture, the ploughing of the land, the sowing of seed and the harvest are all, indeed, mentioned in the Gāthās; nevertheless they are treated as subordinate to the care of the cow.

We thus find the people of the Gāthās in a particular phase of civilization, which will be recognized by every one who is familiar with the laws of the early economic development of nations. I mean the first transition from the life of the nomad to that of the settler, which is so closely bound up everywhere with the breeding of cattle. A people who have devoted themselves to cattle-breeding and have experienced how much more difficult it is to keep herds of large cattle than flock of sheep and goats, become naturally inclined

¹ Cf. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 177-179; 403-406; 465-468 (*vide supra*, pp. 19-120; 264-265; pp. 310-312).

² Cf. Ys. XXVIII. 1; XXIX. 1-10; XXXI. 9-11, 15; XXXII. 12, 15; XXXIII. 3, & c.

to greater stability and more permanent settlements in one place. Stronger and more lasting dwelling are erected; fields are cultivated with greater care and more systematically than by nomads, who support themselves only by reckless *raubbau*.

That I am drawing a real, and not merely a fanciful picture of the economic conditions of the Gāthā people, may be demonstrated by innumerable passages. It is asserted, in express terms, that it is the cow which is the giver of permanent homes; which means that by cattle-breeding lasting settlements are occasioned and developed, (Ys. XLVIII. 6). And, since continuous dwelling in one and the same place must naturally lead to a systematic tilling of the soil, the breeding of cattle is accompanied with the development of agriculture. This is expressed in the Gāthās (Ys. XXXI. 10) in the following wise:—The cow decides in favour of the active labourer; among agriculturists alone she finds the care and attention she requires. This explains what Dr. Roth has already remarked:—"The two verses, 9 and 10, express the singular idea that the cow, the creation of which was a sign of God's special favour towards mankind, has, despising other masters, allowed herself to be as it were the property of the peasant."¹

We observe a difference in the latter books of the Avesta. Herds still play an important part; but here agriculture and cattle-breeding are held in *equal* honour. Let us read only the third Fargard of the Vendidad, which is devoted entirely to inculcating the duty of cultivating the land, of raising cattle and attending to all things connected therewith, and we are at once struck by this fact, that agriculture had at least become equal in importance to cattle-breeding. One need only compare the list of the meritorious works which delight the Spirit of the Earth:—I.—Piety and a law-abiding course of life. II.—The founding of a permanent household. III.—The cultivation of grain, of fodder for cattle, and the planting of trees. IV.—The breeding of sheep and cows (Vd. III. 1-5). Agriculture has, likewise, reached a comparatively high state of technical development. The land is artificially irrigated and drained. Ditches, wells, and canals are made; in short the Old Irānian knows how to assist sparing nature by means of art.

Moreover, along with the economic change, a religious revolution is plainly observed in the Gāthās, and the most noteworthy feature is that they are both intimately connected. The new doctrine is often represented as being oppressed and endangered. At first it is slowly gaining ground among the Arian people. The teaching of Zarathushtra finds followers among the

1 "Die beiden, verse 9 und 10, sprechen den eigenthümlichen Gedanken aus, dass die Kuh, deren Schöpfung eine besondere Gunst Gottes gegen die Menschen ist, andere Herren verschmähend sich dem Bauern gleichsam zum Eigenthum gegeben hat." (Ys XXXI. p. 24.

peasants, while the nomads keep aloof from it. It recommends the keeping of herds and extols the founding of permanent settlements, and Zarathushtra is described in the twenty-ninth chapter of the Yasna, as the one chosen by the Almighty and His Amesha-spands to protect the cow from the oppression of the wicked.¹ Zarathushtra then, perhaps a name representing an entire epoch in the history of the civilization of the Avesta people, appears before us as the reformer equally of the economic and of the religious life.

We turn to the later Avesta and quite a different view unfolds itself before us. While the Gāthās exhibit an *ecclesia militans* (a church militant), here, on the contrary, we find the church firmly established. The direction of the people is in the hands of a favoured class. The Āthravans, whose name never occurs in the Gāthās,² form the first order. The religious struggle for existence has ceased. There are, it is true, the wicked ones, the unbelievers and the false prophets. These are cursed, denounced, punished, but not feared. The doctrine of Zarathushtra is finally established. Sacrifices, ceremonies, customs, laws, and also such precepts as relate to daily life occupy considerable space.

But, although from what was simple in the beginning a mature system has developed, the later parts of the Avesta still deal with the simple and homely lives of peasants and shepherds. Here also religion is quite inseparable from the punctual fulfilment of the professional duties of the peasantry.³ But at the same time other passages are not wanting, in which meritoriousness of cattle-breeding and agriculture is extolled, where the divine agencies are implored to grant the possession of happy homesteads and innumerable herds of horned cattle and horses.⁴

Finally, I refer in this place to Dr. Roth's excellent paper on the "Calendar of the Avesta and the Gāhanbars,"⁵ which, I believe, safely expounds the theory that the Avesta calendar was intended for a nation composed of agriculturists and herdsmen, whose annual feasts coincided respectively with the incidents of a farm life. Besides the festivals celebrated at the summer and winter solstices, there were also other feasts at the seasons of mowing, gathering the harvest, and driving the herds into summer-quarters. Moreover, the Avesta calendar, as I have already shown, bears the character of an essentially

¹ Moreover, this hymn must have been composed at the time of some specially grievous disaster; for the Soul of the Cow even doubts the possibility of its protection by Zarathushtra. The other passages, which point to the struggle for existence of the new religion and its close connection with the economic revolution, are Ys. XXVIII. 6; XXX. 2; XXXI. 1, 11-12, 18; XXXII. 3-7, 10; XLIV. 9; XLV. 1; XLVI. 14, &c.

² Comp. my *Ostirān*. *Kultur*, p. 465; (*supra* p. 310).

³ Let us read only Vd. III. 23-33.

⁴ Cf., e.g., Ys. LX. 2-3; Ys. XI. 1-2; Yt. VIII. 19; X. 3, 11; V. 86, 98 and *passim*.

⁵ *ZddmG.* vol. XXXIV. p. 698.

lunar chronology, which could only be conceivable in a highly primitive stage of civilization.¹

Two conclusions may be deduced from the above facts :—

I. The character of the entire Avesta shows clearly that the civilization it describes was simply a civilization of agriculturists and herdsmen. It cannot be supposed that under a mighty empire, such as that founded by the Achæmenides, the priesthood could have maintained such close relations with rural affairs, and that religious duty and the fulfilment of *agricultural* pursuits could have had such intimate reciprocal action, as even to be regarded as identical.

II. In the Avesta itself we find clear proofs of domestic and social progress. The Gāthās carry us back to a very early epoch, when portions of the Avesta people made the first attempts to introduce cattle-breeding together with the formation of permanent settlements. In the later Avesta, agriculture and cattle-breeding go hand in hand, and it even seems that prominence is given to the former.² Again, in the Gāthās, we see Zoroastrianism struggling for existence, while in the rest of the Avesta it appears victorious and firmly established. The Gāthās, therefore, were composed earlier than the other portions of the Avesta.

III.

The primitive and antique conditions of the Avesta people, however, are revealed by a series of particular facts, which seem deserving of special notice.

I.—The Avesta people do not seem to have yet known of salt and its uses.

¹ This seems to me to be a very important argument in favour of the great age of the Avesta. It is impossible to conceive that a primitive rural calendar could have found a place in the writings of the priests at the time of the Achæmenidae or even later, when the Irānians were in the closest communication with the Chaldeans. As specially archaic traits of the calendar I note the following :—1.—Time was reckoned simply from one lunar phase to another. 2.—The week consisted, therefore, of fifteen days, as we may gather clearly from the intervals between the periods of the festivals. 3.—The variability of the synodic month was compensated by the insertion of an additional or 15th day in each half, which could evidently be omitted at the beginning if required. Comp. *Ostirān. Kultur*, pp. 314 *seq. supra.* pp. 204 *seq.* Prof. C. de Harlez is of opinion that the calendar of the Avesta was simply an invention of the priests (*H. 2*, pp. 165 *seq.*). This, however, is only true of the names of the days and months. Dr. Roth has pointed out how, in the same way, the Gāhanbars are intimately connected with the life of the citizen (*Zddm G.* vol. XXXIV. pp. 698 *seq.*).

² Also Roth (*ibid.* p. 714) says : “ *Die Irānier des Awestā sind gleichmässig Bauern und Viehzüchter ; nur in den Leidern nimmt die Herde die erste Stelle ein, wie im Veda.* ” “The Irānians of the Avesta are at the same time farmers and cattle-breeders ; only in the hymns, as in the Veda, the preference is given to herds.”

II.—Glass was unknown.

III.—Coined money was not in circulation. Payment was made in kind.

IV.—The working of iron was unknown. The Avesta nation is still in the bronze period.

If I succeed in establishing these four points, or even one of them, it must, I believe, be admitted that we can no longer think of assigning the composition of the Avesta to the latest centuries before our era.

On the first point I may be brief; for in support of our view, we can adduce an argument, than which none can be better, namely, the fact that salt is nowhere mentioned in the Avesta. However striking this must appear—for in the lists of eatables there would have been many opportunities for mentioning this most important of condiments—it cannot be supposed that this absence of any reference to salt is to be attributed to a mere accident. I should have left this subject almost untouched, had it not been worth while to give prominence to the curious coincidence that in the *Rig-veda*, too, salt is never mentioned.¹ The question, therefore, forces itself upon us, whether in this point, as in many others, we should not recognize a close analogy in the conditions of the Vedic and the Avesta Arians during the progress of their civilization. Allowing this to be only a possibility, or, at most, a probability, it must, at any rate, serve to strengthen other arguments. If we can otherwise prove that the civilization of the Avesta bears marks of great antiquity, we can no longer look upon this absence of any name for salt as a mere accident, but a highly characteristic mark of the nature of that civilization.²

That glass was unknown to the Avesta people can be proved with almost absolute certainty.

In the eighth Fargard of the *Vendidād* we find an enumeration of manufactures in which fire is employed. In my “Civilization of the Eastern Irānians,”³ I have rendered the expressions *Khumbat-hacha-Zemaini-pachikāt*

¹ Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 54.

² Cf. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 149-150. [It is, indeed, very curious that salt and its use were not well known to the Avesta people as well as to the Arians of the *Rig-veda*, notwithstanding the existence of salt lakes and salt-steppes in Central Asia and near the Indus. It seems, therefore, that the Indo-Irānian people made little or no use of salt, but that, according to M. Hehn (*Das Salz*, p. 17), its uses became known to the European section of the Indo-Germanic tribe after its emigration from the fatherland. That there were salt lakes in Irān does not necessarily argue in favour of Prof. de Harlez's theory that salt was not unknown to the Avesta nation *Tr. n.*]

³ *Vide supra*. p. 254, note 3, *Ostirānische Kultur*, p. 390.

and *Khumbat-hachat-Yāmo-pachikāt* "the burning of tiles," and "the burning of pottery." Dr. Spiegel has, in the first volume of his "Commentary on the Avesta" (p. 264), identified *yāma* with *jām* and translated it "glass." Dr. Justi also writes in his Review of my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," :—"In page 390 our author translates *yāma* by 'crockery,' to distinguish it from 'earth' or 'clay' (Av. *Zemaini*) of the preceding sentence. The Pahlavi translation does not throw any light on the meaning, since the same words are somewhat erroneously used in rendering both the passages. But to the second passage there is added a gloss which we might read *dōsinkarān* and translate 'plaster-worker,' (Mod. Pers. *dos* 'flowers worked in plaster,') while the gloss on the first passage is obscure. The Riwāyets give for *Zemaini*, the Mod. Persian word *khum* ('earthenware vessel tile-work'), whilst for *yāma* they give 'tile-furnance.' Dr. Geiger is right in his identification of this word with the Mod. Persian *jām* but *jām* does not mean an earthen vessel, but a glass-bowl, a glass. He is of opinion that glass was unknown to the early Irānians ; nevertheless glass slag must have been familiar to the potters and bronze-workers. Glazed tiles were made in Mesopotamia long before the time of Zarathushtra, and we have an Egyptian glass bottle of the seventeenth century before Christ, showing that the art of glass-painting and the use of the grinding-wheel were already known. Again we have the celebrated picture of the glass-blower on the grave of Beni-Hasan. It is a remarkable fact that the Persian word *abacaein* (Mod. Pers. *ābgīnāh*) was known to the Copts, and that the *Abha-stone* is mentioned under Thothmes III. Although the Avesta may be a very old record, yet it is inconceivable that such a valuable substance as glass should have been unknown to the people it describes."¹

If we consider the question concerning the identification of the word *yāma* with the Mod. Pers. *jām*, the difficulty lies probably in the meaning "goblet." The particular rendering "glass-bowl" is only a secondary development. The authority of tradition, as Dr. Justi has justly remarked, is

¹ Vide J. I, Sp. 1477 : "S. 390 will der Verfasser *jāma* mit "irdenes Gefäss" übersetzen, zum Unterschied von Erde, Lehm (*zemaini*) im vorhergehenden Satz. Die Pehlwi-übersetzung gibt keinen Aufschluss, da sie durch einen Irrthum beide Sätze durch dieselben Worte wiedergibt; doch fügt sie im zweiten Satz eine Glosse hinzu, welche man *dōsin-karān* lesen und Gypsbereiter (*up dōs*, 'Gypsbereite') übersetzen könnte während die Glosse des ersten Satzes dunkel ist. Die Riwāyets haben für *zemaini* np. *khum* (irdenes Gefäss, Ziegelbau), für *jāma* aber Ziegelofen. Wenn G. selbst das np. *jām* vergleicht, so hat er recht, aber *jām* ist nicht ein gebranntes Gefäss, sondern ein Glasbecher, ein Glas; er glaubt, die Altirānier hätten das Glas nicht gekannt, und doch mussten die Töpfer und Erzarbeiter Glasschlacken kennen lernen; glasierte Ziegel sind längst vor Zarathushtra in Mesopotamien fabriziert worden, und man hat eine ägyptische Glasflasche aus dem 17. Jahrhundert, an welcher man bereits die Kunst des Ueberfangens und die Anwendung des Schleifrades erkennt, wie auch die Abbildung der Glasbläser im Grab von Beni-Hasan berühmt ist. Es ist merkwürdig, dass das Koptische das persische Wort *abacaein* (np. *ābgīnāh*) kennt und dass unter Thothmes III. der *Abhastein* erwähnt wird. Es ist undenkbar, dass eine so geschätzte Ware wie das Glas dem Awestavolk unbekannt geblieben wäre, selbst wenn das Awestā sehr alt wäre."

uncertain ; however, it is generally admitted that tradition has never recognized either *zemaini* or *yāma* as glass. From the glass slag familiar to the potter and the bronze-worker to the fashioning of glass vessels is a considerable step. As regards the knowledge of glass-making among the Egyptians and Mesopotamians, it cannot supply any argument as to the acquaintance of the Avesta people with that art.

It will be conceded to me that Dr. Justi's whole argument rests on this truth, that, if it were possible from the Avesta to show that as a fact glass was unknown, the great antiquity of this record together with the isolation of its people and the seclusion of their trade, would be proved beyond question. But such a proof can be actually adduced.

Wherever the Avesta treats of the purification of polluted vessels, it enumerates the materials of which the vessels used are made. They are—1, gold ; 2, silver ; 3, brass ; 4, copper ; 5, stone ; 6, clay ; 7, wood.¹ Here glass is not named. Moreover, it is clear that, had there been vessels of glass, they would have been subject to cleansing and would have required cleansing just as much as vessels of metal, stone, or earthenware.

We now come to the question respecting the use of coined money.

Again Dr. Justi differs from me, saying :—" Also in consequence of over-estimating the age of several passages in the Avesta,² our author is led to doubt the existence of money. Even supposing that *shaeta* does not mean 'money,' but only 'possessions, wealth,' yet the expression *asperena*, which means a *dirhem*, according to the Pahlavi Translation and the Zend-Pahlavi Farhang, points to the fact that in Mesopotamia a system of regular coinage and weights was not unknown."

According to Dr. Justi's representation, it appears that I treat the great age of the Avesta as a kind of dogma, and on the ground of it reject entirely the possibility of coined money having existed in its time. In my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians,"³ I have pursued a diametrically opposite course. The basis of my argument is the text itself, and I quote three passages from the Avesta, all of which, as far as I know, treat of the question of

¹ Vd. VII. 73-75.

² Vide J. 1, Sp. 1477 : " Auch ein anderes Bedenken nämlich die Existenz von Geld anzunehmen, ergibt sich dem Verfasser aus der Ueberschätzung des Alters mancher Awestästücke ; wenn auch *saeta* nicht "Geld," sondern "Besitz, Reichthum" bezeichnet, so deutet doch der Ausdruck *asperena*, nach der Pehlewübersetzung und dem Zend-Pehlewi Farhang ein *Dirhem*, darauf hin, dass man das in Mesopotamien übliche Münz und Gewichtssystem kannte." Also in Sp. 1476, Justi speaks generally of "certain" parts of the Avesta, the age of which must not be over-rated. This statement is not very clear. It would have been better, had he indicated by a few words what passages he was referring to. According to his remarks it must be assumed that he considers a certain portion of the book to be of a great age, since he never speaks of any over-estimation of the age of the whole Avesta.

³ *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 396-397 (*supra* pp. 258-259).

payments, and which Dr. Justi never mentions. But in all these passages cattle (asses, oxen, horses, camels, sheep) are expressly mentioned as the medium of payment.

These passages occur in the following connections :—

(a) Where the Avesta speaks of the payment of fees by a patient to a doctor. Here it is noteworthy that the very smallest fee is to be paid in kind, viz., in bread or milk, (*Vd.* VII. 41-43).

(b) In treating of the atonement for a broken promise, or of the giving of a pledge on setting an agreement (*Vd.* IV. 2 *seq.*)¹

(c) Where reference is made to paying down the appointed fees to a priest after the ceremony of purification has been performed (*Vd.* IX. 37-39).

Is it at all possible for anybody to believe seriously that the Magi of the later Achaemenian period or even of the Seleucian or Parthian epoch, would have consented to receive payments in sheep, oxen, or horses?

On the authority of these passages, we are, I believe, justified in forming an opinion as to money transactions among the Avesta people; and thus it only remains to explain the terms *shaeta* and *asperena*.

M. Tomaschek is of opinion that *shaeta* may possibly have designated also coined money, since in the Persian language we find the feudal term *shait* used for a rouble.² This hardly seems to me to be a valid argument. The etymology of the word *shaeta* or *khshaeta* and its use in different passages prove that in the Avesta language the word signifies nothing more than "fortune, possession." With *shaeta*, (*i.e.* with cows, sheep, or horses), a deed of blood is expiated.³ A warlike hero protects his *khshaeta*, that is, his goods and chattels from thieves and robbers.⁴ Ardvi-sura grants prosperity to the *shaeta*. She multiplies the possessions of her adorers.⁵ I will return further on to the passage in which *shaetavat*, "the opulent man," is contrasted with the *ashaeta*, "the pauper."

So in every case *shaeta* has only a general meaning; and, if we hold firmly to the view that the word means "possessions," it becomes quite easy to explain how in later times, after coined money had come into use, the name *shaeta* came to be applied to it. A change of meaning perfectly analogous is

¹ For explanation cf. *ibid.*, pp. 454-455; *supra* p. 302.

² *Ausland*, 1883, p. 825, (rouble = 86 shilling).

³ *Vd.* IV. 44. Cf. my *O. K. A.* p. 396, note 3, and p. 452, n. 2 (*Supra.* p. 259, note 2 *supra* p. 34, n. 2).

⁴ *Yt.* XIII. 97. Cf. *hush-hām-beretem-shaetem* in *Yt.* XVIII. 1.

⁵ *Shu:itō-frādhana* occurring side by side with the somewhat synonymous expressions *vāithwō-frādhana* and *ga:ithō-frādhana* in *Yt.* V. 1; XIII, 4.

exemplified in the Latin word *pecunia*, which originally meant simply "the possession of cattle," then came to mean "fortune" generally, and finally, in spite of its etymological signification, strictly denoted "coined money."

With respect to the meaning of *asperena* I must express myself somewhat more fully, since we here come to a point which is of paramount importance in determining the age of the Avesta.

As a matter of course I admit that *asperena* is used to express "value," and that a very trifling one. The word occurs twice in our text. We first find, in the fourth Fargard of the Vendidād (48), the expression *asperenōmazō*—"anything that has the value of an *asperena*," in a rather obscure context, in connection with the terms *anumayō-mazō*, *staorō-mazō*, and *vīrō-mazō*. The second time it occurs, in the fifth Fargard of the Vendidād (60), in a prohibition against the throwing away of a piece of old clothing, even if it be only of the value of an *asperena* or of an *avachina*. Besides, I also admit that *asperena* has the appearance of being a borrowed word introduced into the Avesta language and might be traced, according to Prof. C. de Harlez, to the Semitic root *saphar*, or, according to Prof. Halévy, to *ἄσπερον*. Dr. Justi seems to suggest the Turkish word *asper*.

Now what conclusion may we deduce from what has been said above? The three passages quoted by me from the Avesta—and they are the only ones which directly refer to payments—show clearly that cattle served the Avesta people as a standard of value and as a medium of barter. If then *asperena* really denotes a coin,¹ those passages should not, on that account, be ignored in explaining the text. They retain their value and significance, and we must own that we are here face to face with a paradox, which it is our task to solve. However, we would not be warranted in basing an argument on the expression *asperena* alone, and therefore assigning a recent date to the Avesta for, it would be quite surprising that this mode of payment in kind should have been preserved as a regular practice side by side with payment in current money. It would, likewise, seem strange that the *asperena* should have been the only coin in use, and that we should hear nothing as to other coins, viz., Dariks and Drachms. At least there is not sufficient ground here to speak of a system of coinage, since such a system must necessarily comprise various coins of different values. Even if we agree to what Dr. Justi believes concerning the word *asperena* and its meaning, yet the passage (48) in the fourth Fargard of the Vendidād, most certainly proves that the *asperena* was used only along with cattle, as a standard of value.

¹ But it is also possible that the *asperena* were small rough pieces of metal or some other kind of money (rings or the like), used in barter to make up differences in value. So it is well known that in ancient Rome, when people were still wont to make payments in kind, small pieces of copper were for the same purpose weighed out and circulated.

The inconsistency, therefore, does not lie in the employment of cattle as a medium of payment; but in the mention of the *asperena* in the Avesta. If this word is really as modern as it is supposed to be, may we not assume that it was perhaps inserted in the text in a later revision of the Avesta? The motive is easy to understand. In making payments in cattle, the smallest measure of value, the sheep, was after all considerably high. People, therefore, thought it necessary to introduce articles of smaller value, and adopted not only foreign coins, but also their foreign names. This may probably have happened also in old times. The word *asperena*, I believe, must therefore be traced to *sāphar*. Thus we have in *asperena* an instance of a civilized custom adopted by the Irānians from their Semitic neighbours which was almost similar to the old Indian *manā*.¹ Although this idea, which had of course its origin among the Semites, is mentioned in the Rig-veda, it has never occurred to anybody to doubt for that very reason the antiquity of the civilization of the Vedic Arians. Moreover, if relations may be proved to have existed between the Babylonians and the Vedic Indians, it is not to be wondered at if similar relations also existed with the Irānians, who had pushed their way into the district of Ragha.

However that may be, the term *asperena* must not at all be allowed to interfere with the type of civilization, which otherwise appears so conspicuously in the Avesta. If, in this respect, some authors have deduced conclusions of too sweeping a kind, it only indicates how dangerous it is to rely upon an isolated word, ignoring all undoubted passages which afford an unquestionably authentic explanation.²

We may also observe that neither of the passages, in which the word *asperena* is found, occurs in a succinct context. In both cases, the word or expression might be struck out, without in any way affecting the sense of the whole. The suspicion of a recent insertion is here much more justifiable than in any of the three passages, Vend. IV. 2 *seq.*; VII. 41 *seq.*; and IX. 37 *seq.*

I must now discuss another matter which seems to be important. Other foreign words have been discovered in the Avesta, some of which are sup-

¹ Comp. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp. 50-51.

² Dr. Justi goes too far when he says: "*Man darf aber hier ein Argument für die Abfassung des Vendidad nicht im Osten sondern im Nordwesten Irāns erkennen, wo der Verkehr mit anderen Völkern fremde Kulturelemente einführt, die dem durch die Wüste getrennten Osten erst spät zukamen.*" "But we may here find an argument in favour of the theory that the Vendidad was composed not in the East but in the North-West of Irān, where the early intercourse with foreign nations would have introduced foreign elements of civilization, but which could only at a later period have reached the East naturally separated by the deserts." Now, is it possible to suppose that the word *asperena* is of any weight in determining the home of the Avesta! If the word is as modern as Justi indeed assumes, it would at least be odd to think that the elements of Semitic civilization had pressed forward into Eastern Irān.

posed to be Aramaic, and some of Greek origin. Prof. Halévy has been kind enough to communicate to me his views on this point, explaining briefly the ideas expressed in his paper read before the *Société de Linguistique*, wherein he refers to the following expressions :—

I. Words of Aramaic origin :	<i>Tanūra</i>	= תנורה
	<i>Naska</i>	= נקחא
	<i>Gudha</i>	= גידא
	<i>Guñda</i>	= גנידא
II. Words of Greek origin :	<i>Gæsu</i>	= γαισον
	<i>Asperena</i>	= ἄσπερον
	<i>Danare</i>	= δανάρων
	<i>Khwaza</i>	= χούς

Surprising as this list of foreign words may appear, its significance diminishes considerably on closer scrutiny.

In the first place, the word *gudha*—occurring only once in Yasht, XV. 27—seems to be a proper name in the Avesta. Moreover, it belongs apparently to the river district of the Rangha, the Jaxartes. Hence it seems unwarrantable to assert that this word owes its origin to the Semites. Again, some of the manuscripts give the form *gaodha*, instead of *gudha*, which could not be derived from גידא. I am inclined to trace the etymology of the word to the root *guh*, “to hide.”¹ It is most probable that the name would then designate a river which loses itself entirely in the sand, as occurs very often in Eastern Irān.

The origin of the word *naska* is, likewise, not so well ascertained as would at first sight appear. Its derivation from the Semitic is on the authority of Dr. Spiegel or Dr. Haug.² M. Burnouf, on the contrary, would derive the word from the root *nas*, “to annihilate,” or, better still, from *naz*, “to unite, to sew.” In the latter case we can compare it in meaning with the Sanskrit word *sūtra*. So we have here one hypothesis opposed to another, and nobody will assert that the one has greater authority than the other.³ The same may be said respecting the word *guñda*. Dr. Fr. Müller assigns to it the

¹ The Eastern Irānian words *guz* and *gud* would then be related to the Sanskrit *guh*, just as *vaz* and *vad* to *vah*. That the modern *h* was originally a dental, is proved by the Greek χυδ. *Xeúdw*. The latter can be traced to its primary form *kudh*, which Fick, too, considers to be identical with *guh* (*Wtb.* vol. I. p. 30). Moreover, it should be remembered that the word *gudhra*, “hidden,” is preserved in the Zend-Pahlavi Glossary (Fick, *ibid.*, p. 315).

² Comp. Fr. Justi, *Handbuch der Zend-sprache*, *sub voce*.

³ *Naska* occurs only once in the compound form *naskō-frasagh*, but in a passage where it is essential to the metre (Ys. IX. 22). Thus it can, no doubt, be proved from the original text of the Avesta.

meaning "plenty," and identifies it with the Armenian *gound*. Prof. Halévy relies on Dr. Müller's theory. But this meaning of "plenty" does not agree with the context. We, therefore, adhere again, as I believe is generally done, to the explanation given by Dr. Spiegel (*Comm.* vol. I. p. 102), who compares it to the Modern Persian words *ghund* and *ghundah* "*massa farinaria*." Thus with this etymology of *guñda*, too, we may rest confidently within the pale of the Irānian languages.

The identity of *tanūra* with the Hebrew תַּנּוּר and the Arabic *tanūr*, is beyond question. But must we, on the ground that this word occurs in our text, assign a later origin to the Avesta itself? Certainly not, on any account. It is as difficult to find a satisfactory derivation of the word in Semitic as in Irānian. I, therefore, believe that it is a word as foreign to the one as to the other stock of languages. When we consider that before the progress of the Arian and Semitic civilization, a so-called Turānian one had developed in Anterior Asia, and that these Turānian tribes possessed peculiar skill in the art of working metals, we are justified in assuming that the expression *tanūr*, meaning originally a "smelting furnace," owed its origin to their language and was inherited as a technical term, together with the art of smelting itself, as well by the Irānians as by the Semites. Even granting that *tanūra* can only be explained as a Semitic word, we have still no reason to doubt the great antiquity of the Avesta; for it is not impossible that some civilized intercourse may have existed, though in no considerable degree, in pre-Median times between Mesopotamia and the plateau of Irān.

We must now turn to the words of Greek origin. Of the identity between ἄσπερον and *asperena* I have spoken already. The comparison between *khvazha*, or rather, I believe *khawzha* or *khavzha*, and χους, is at least very daring. Since, as a rule, every foreign word retains its original form, we should rather expect *khūzha*. Moreover, an apparent etymology for this word is found in the Arian language, and one which I believe, is universally adopted by Zend scholars. In Sanskrit *khubja* means "crooked." *Khavzha*, then, must have originally meant "the crooked vessel." That this is the correct derivation is proved by the Mod. Persian words *kūz* and *kūzah*, which still mean "crooked" and at the same time mean "can," "jug," or "bowl."¹

The word *gaesu* has already been very often discussed. Let me refer to Dr. Justi's *Handbuch* as well as to M. Schrader's *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, pp. 327-328. The Greek term γαῖσον is itself a loan-word of Celtic origin; but it cannot, therefore, be shown that, as a foreign word, it has again passed from the Greeks to the Irānians. It is more probable—and this view is held by no less an authority than M. von Hehn²—that the word *gaesu* is

¹ Cf. Spiegel, *Commentar*, vol. I. p. 252; Justi, *Handbuch*, *sub voce*; Vullers, *Lexicon Persico-Latinum*, *sub voce* *kuz*.

² Vide *Culturpflanzen und Haustiere*, p. 352.

originally Irānian ; but at the time of the Celtic migration to Asia Minor, it passed from the Irānians to the Celts and may have, finally, been introduced into Greece at the time of the expedition of Brennus. In support of the priority of this Irānian word one might adduce the fact that M. Tomaschek has discovered an equivalent to *gassu* in the Sirikuli dialect, in the word *gisk* meaning "club," "cudgel," and that, according to M. Bickell, that word may be akin to the Latin *veru*.¹ By no means, then, does it bear the character of a foreign word ; on the contrary, it seems to have belonged to the Irānian language from remote antiquity.

The assumption that the Avesta word *danare* is a paraphrase of *δηνάριον* and *denarius*, may also be questioned. The very form of the word might rouse suspicion, when we consider that in Modern Persian the last word appears as *dinār* which, I believe, was originally *dinnār*. We would expect *dināra* or *duenāra*, rather than *danare*. But the Denar is nevertheless a coin, and, as far as I can gather from Dr. Vullers, the Mod. Persian word *dinār* is also used only in this sense. As a measure of weight it never occurs, as is the case with Dirhem. In the Avesta, however, *danare* must designate a dry measure, or perhaps also a weight ; and it is only once mentioned in the Vendidad, XVI. 7. In this passage we find the rule laid down that a menstruating woman shall receive (daily) *dva danare tāyūninām aeva danare khshāurānām* as food. Dr. Spiegel has latterly noticed (*Comm.* vol. I. p. 363) the similarity between *danare* and *δηνάριον*, but he, at one time at least rejected it. He reminds us of the fact that this word is naturally allied to *dāna*, "corn," "wheat," and equivalent to the Sanskrit *dhāna*, Mod. Pers. *dānah*.

Thus we observe that in all cases, where a Greek or Aramaic derivation is assigned to any word, the result is hypothesis opposed to hypothesis. In some instances weighty objections may be raised against the assumption of such derivations. This I must here regard as the principal question. Granted that it were possible to establish an indubitable etymology, still it would constitute no proof against the great age of the Avesta as a whole. Since our record has frequently undergone revisions, all we can do is to draw a special conclusion as to the age of the isolated passages in question. I have already suggested this occasionally in discussing the question concerning the word *asperēna* as well as under my fourth preliminary remark ; and it is surely of peculiar importance when the words concerned are, *ἀπαξ λεγόμενα* as is the case, e.g., with *gudha*, *guñda*, *khwazha*, and *naska*. But, even if these words denote measure or weight, we must not ignore the possibility of their having been intentionally altered and adapted to the later conditions of things. I repeat, then, that we ought to be careful not to draw elaborate conclusions as to the history of Irānian civilization from isolated words or

¹ Tomaschek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 66 ; Bickell, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, vol. XII. pp. 438seq.

passages alone ; but we should always see that they do not disagree with other passages in the text.

Now, as regards our last point that iron was unknown to the early Irānians. So far as I know, none of the scholars who doubt the antiquity of the Avesta, have touched upon this subject. None of them seem to have considered how close an affinity it indicates between the civilization of the Avesta and that of the Rig-veda, between the civilization of the Eastern Irānians and that of the Indians of the Panjāb. And yet the importance of the subject must be evident to all.

The word employed in the Avesta for the metal most commonly in use is *ayañh*, corresponding to the Old Indian *ayas*, to the Latin, *aes*, and to the Gothic *aiz*. Dr. Zimmer has proved in his *Altindisches Leben* (pp. 51 seq.), that the Vedic *ayas* denotes "brass," i.e., copper-brass, bronze ; and, as I believe I have already proved,¹ the corresponding word in the Avesta must have had the same meaning. This is quite apparent from the appellations in which *ayañh* is used, and which are strikingly in accord with the Homeric epithets applied to χαλκός. Names of metals are constantly alluded to in the Avesta, but among them all none, except *ayañh*, could possibly be taken to mean iron. The working of this metal, therefore, was unknown to the Arians of the Avesta. But, is it possible for anybody to maintain that in the latest centuries before Christ the Irānians used as weapons, swords, helmets, clubs, and arrow-heads made of bronze ?²

IV.

Let me now recapitulate the reasons which seem to me to prove the great antiquity of the Avesta. It must be conceded that these are only special arguments, based on isolated passages. But then these are not such passages as do not at the same time form an integral portion of the whole text, and such as might possibly be considered to be a gloss. The majority of my arguments are based upon the Avesta as a whole, and I do not think that the etymology of an isolated word can ever afford sufficient evidence, from which to draw conclusions as to the history of the civilization of a people.

¹ Vide *Ostirānische Kultur*, p. 148 :—"The mountain-ranges lying in Central Asia are rich in iron mines, which, according to the testimony of the Avesta, existed, likewise, within the *Hara*. From the fact that the metal called *ayañh* in the Avesta, was in use for making weapons and chattels, we are not to conclude that here iron alone was meant ; rather copper-brass or bronze, which is an alloy of copper and zinc, is referred to. That epithets such as 'brilliant' or 'yellow,' 'flame-coloured,' nay even 'golden,' would ever have been applied to iron or steel, is, indeed, scarcely possible ; on the contrary, these appellations are quite appropriate in the case of bronze. Likewise, the corresponding word *ayas* in the Rig-veda does not denote iron, but copper-brass, which was far more in use among the Vedic Arians. Copper was also in favour with the Achāians of the Homeric period. Their weapons and vessels were also made of brass which is described, just as in the Avesta, as red and glittering."

² Cf. *supra*, pp. 24 seq.

1. The Avesta does not contain any historical description whatever.
2. None of the names of tribes, otherwise in general use, are to be found in it.
3. It contains no allusion to any of the cities of Eastern or Western Irān, celebrated in historic times properly so called, with the exception of Ragha.
4. The economical conditions of the Avesta people are those of a pastoral tribe and of a rural population; and even the priests shared in agricultural pursuits. That such conditions were most highly characteristic of the entire civilized life of the Old Irānian, may be gathered from the general tenor of the Avesta, especially from that of the Gāthās, and more particularly from the nature of the calendar.
5. The primitive character of the Avesta people is evident from their ignorance of the use of (a) salt, (b) glass, (c) coined money and (d) iron.

Finally, I must now notice some other arguments, from which it might perhaps be inferred that the Avesta was composed in a late period. Of these, the most noteworthy have been adduced by Prof. C. de Harlez in his excellent "Introduction" to the second edition of his translation of the Avesta (H. 1. pp. cxcii. seq.; cf. H. 4, pp. 494-495):¹

I. The modern forms of the names of places mentioned in the first Far-gard of the Vendidad. Here we find *Bākhdi* for *Bākhtri*; *Mouru* for *Marghu*. Prof. Harlez also refers to *Bawri* for *Babiru* and *Raji* for *Ragha*. As regards the last two, *Bawri* need not be taken into account, for, being a name, it is quite possible that it may have been incorrectly written.² *Rajōit* occurs only in Yasna, XIX. 18. Since, without exception, we meet with the regular form *Ragha* in other passages, and since even in the passage quoted it

¹ This book is unfortunately very little known in Germany. In size and contents, it forms a work by itself, an encyclopædia of the Avesta. I only regret that I did not make use of it while writing my *Ostirānische Kultur*.

² Halévy informs me through a letter that *Bawri* might correspond to the Aramaic **בְּבִרִי**. In that case this word, like *Mouru*, must be regarded as an adaptation of the old to the modern form of the name due to a later revision of the Avesta.

immediately follows *Rajōit*, I believe I am right in conjecturing that this form is an appellative, possibly meaning "kingdom, dominion"; otherwise, its spelling should be altered.

However, an argument based on the modern character of forms of geographical names occurring in the Avesta, is not very cogent. In its general aspect the Avesta, as few have it, does not seem to be the work originally written by some of the first Zoroastrians, but a transcript bearing very plain traces of revision. What, therefore, is more probable than that, in such a revision, the geographical names in the original should have been adapted to the forms of those names then current ?¹

Even Dr. Spiegel says : "I have often had occasion to remark that I attach no importance to any linguistic proofs ; for, even granting that we can prove that its language is primeval, one might nevertheless endeavour to find an expedient and must assume that the book was written after the language had ceased to be used, since internal evidence obliges us to ascribe to the book a comparatively later date."² We may certainly say with equal justice : since the internal evidence of the Avesta is in favour of its high antiquity, while the language often exhibits some modern forms, we must assume a revision of the Avesta after its language had ceased to be spoken.

II. In the fourth Fargard of the Vendidad (47 seq.) abstemiousness, homelessness, celibacy, and prohibition against eating flesh are inveighed against. This passage must have been directed against the gradual encroachments of Buddhism, the representative of which is the Gautama mentioned in Yasht, XIII. 16.

Now, let me request Zend scholars to examine the passage which bears upon this question. Nobody will assert that we can with certainty regard it as a polemic against Buddhism. We could at best, and with all due reservation, consider this view as a mere conjecture, on the basis of which it would be quite dangerous to form any conclusion as to the history of Irānian civilization.

The text runs thus :--

Adhacha. uiti. nāirivaitē zi. tē. ahmāt. pourum. framraoimi. Spitama Zarathushtra. yatha. maghavo-fravākhshōit, visānē. ahmat. yatha. evīsāi, puthrānē. ahmat. yatha. apulhrāi, shaetavatō. ahmat. yatha. ashaetāi. hāu-

¹ *Bākhdi*, at least, must be regarded as a corrupt form, since there was no period in the history of Irānian languages, when the *r* could have dropped out of the name *Baktra*. Even to the present day the city is called *Balkh*.

² "Ich habe öfter Gelegenheit gehabt zu bemerken, dass ich auf den sprachlichen Beweis nichts gebe ; denn gesetzt auch, es liesse sich nachweisen, dass die Sprache uralt sei, so würde man doch nach einem Auskunftsmittel suchen und etwa annehmen müssen, das Awestā sei nach dem Austerben der Sprache geschrieben, falls innere Gründe uns nötigen, das Buch einer späteren Periode zuzuschreiben."

cha . ayā . narā . vohu . manō . jāgerebushtarō . aghat . yō . gēush.uruthware . hāmpafrāitī . yatha . hāu . yō . nōit . itha .

Prof. Harlez himself translates it :—¹

“ Je proclame pour toi qui a une épouse, ô saint Zoroastre, la priorité sur celui qui n'en use point ; pour le chef de maison, sur celui qui n'en possède point ; pour le père de famille, sur celui qui n'a pas d'enfants ; pour le possesseur de terres sur celui qui n'en a point. Celui qui nourrit et développe (son corps) en mangeant de la viande, obtient le bon esprit bien mieux que celui qui ne le fait pas.”

First let me remark that the whole passage, and especially the connection with what follows, is obscure. Prof. Harlez has certainly translated the concluding portion of the passage incorrectly. According to his opinion, *geush* ought to be considered as instrumental ; however, it is not possible. It could often be rendered “ he who fills the body of the cattle,” i.e., whoever feeds them.² This passage, therefore, implies a meaning common in the Avesta, viz., that cattle-breeding is a meritorious work. And such is the clear interpretation of the passage — “ Such a man possesses more of the good-mind (*vohu-manō*) than one who does not do it.” *Vohu-manō*, the genius of good-mind, is, according to the Zoroastrian teaching, also the protector of herds.

Again, the beginning of the passage, which contains the antithesis, *nāirivat* and *maghavō-favākhshi*, is not quite clear. At all events this much seems to be manifest, that the man, who lives in lawful marriage, should be preferred to any one who satisfies his desires in other ways. According to the whole tenor of the Avesta, it cannot seem strange that a man who lives in a village community, who brings up children, makes for himself a household and becomes the possessor of fields and herds, is more deserving in the eyes of a Zoroastrian than one who fails to do so. Let us only bear in mind how the possession of children is always looked upon as a direct blessing of God,³ and compare therewith what I have already said with reference to the meritoriousness of a settled country-life according to the testimony of the Avesta.

¹ [*Avesta traduit*, 2nd ed. p. 48 : “ I proclaim for your who have a spouse, O holy Zoroaster ! the priority over him who has none ; for the head of a household, over him who possesses none ; for the *pater-familias*, over him who has no offspring ; for the owner of land, over him who owns no piece of ground. He who nourishes and develops (his body) by eating meat, acquires the good mind, far better than he who does it not.” (Vd. IV. 47-48). *Tr. n.*]

² *Uruthware* translated “ body, stomach.” If, according to Harlez, this word signifies “ growth,” the passage implies : “ Whoever furthers the growth of cattle.” Thus the meaning is not changed. Here Geldner agrees with me (*Vide Studien zum Avesta*, p. 5).

³ Cf. my *O. K. A.* pp. 234-236 (*Supra*. pp. 144-145).

What conclusion, then, must we draw from Vendidād, IV. 47-48, without doing violence to its meaning? Simply this, that the Avesta frequently alludes to the contrast between civilized and uncivilized life, especially between the life of settled herdsmen and peasants and that of nomads. That this is the correct interpretation is emphatically shown by the use of the antonymous words *visānē* and *evīsāi*. The peasant and the herdsman live in permanent villages (*visō*), the nomad on the contrary knows no settled life.

Moreover, as regards *Gaotama*, who is supposed to be the representative of Buddhism, which forced its way into Irān, the name only occurs once in Yt. XIII. 16. Prof. Westergaard, however, reads *gaotema*, and gives also the variant *gaotuma* in two other MSS., but never *gaotama*.¹ This is important, since Prof. Harlez expressly says:—*La forme gaotama est le produit d'une transcription faite à l'ouïe et non d'une dérivation naturelle*. Thus *gaotama* might certainly be regarded as a simple misspelling of the Indian name, *Gaotama Buddha*; but *Gaotema* is purely Irānian.²

To this it is to be added that the passage cited above is obscure. Prof. C. de Harlez himself observes (*Avesta Traduit* 2nd ed. p. 481): “*phrase entièrement obscure*.” Again, the translations of the passage do not at all agree. Passing over Dr. Spiegel's, I shall quote here Prof. Geldner's version (*Metrik des jüngeren Avesta*, pp. 80-81): “Through their power and greatness a man is born skilled in counsel, an adviser, whose words are heard with willingness, who is looked to for instruction, who hears complacently the request of his weaker proteges.”

But, if, in spite of the “*phrase entièrement obscure*,” we were to regard Prof. Harlez's translation: “*L'homme naît, intelligent, manifestant ses pensées, entendant bien ce que l'on dit, en qui est déposée l'intelligence, qui échappe aux questions de méchant Gaotama*,”³ as correct, what could we reasonably gather from the passage? This certainly, that the Fravasis will allow one to be born, who is to be a match for a certain Gautema in argument. Now, if we consider that learned controversies were evidently not unknown to the Avesta priests—for instance in the legend of *Yāsta Fryāna* and his dispute with *Akhtyā* in Yt. V. 83;—if we, again, consider that the name *gaotema* is purely Irānian and can be clearly traced to the remotest Arian period, since the Rig-veda, too, speaks of a singer *gotama*, the passage is divested of all possible reference to Buddhism.

¹ [“The form *Gaotama* is due to a transcription based on sound and not to any indigenous derivation.” *Tr.*]

² As far as I know, it was Haug who first started the theory that Yasht, XIII. 16 contained an allusion to Buddhism (cf. “*Essays on the Parsis*,” 2nd ed. by West, p. 208, note).

³ [“The man is born intelligent, manifesting his thoughts, well understanding what is said, in whom is placed the intelligence that solves the questions put by the perverse *Gaotama*.” *Tr.*]

III. In Yt. XIX. 18, Ragha is called a city, in which the Āthravans were possessed of temporal power. But such a sovereignty of the Magi existed in Irān only after the close of the dominion of the Seleucidae. Consequently, this passage must have been written only at that period.

This brings us to a very important question. There is no doubt that even Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 1, pp. 9-10, Sp. 2, pp. 629-635), has, on the authority of this passage, formed a peculiar theory concerning the home as well as the age of the Avesta, the only ground for which lies in the fact that the passage has been variously interpreted so as to lose its original meaning.

I must here consider Prof. Harlez's Introduction, which thoroughly explains the relation of the Avesta Āthravans to the Magi known to us from history.

This learned translator of the Avesta maintains, in the first place, that the Achaemenian kings were not familiar with the Avesta religion. On the contrary, all that we know about the Magi allows us to assert that their doctrines and their customs were perfectly identical with those which we find recorded in the Avesta. To this must also be added that Khosru Parviz (531-579 A.D.) in a proclamation given in the Dinkard, says :—"*que Vishtāspa fit réunir tous les ouvrages écrits en la langue des Mages pour acquérir la connaissance de la loi mazdéene.*"¹ Since it seems hardly possible that a country of so little importance as Bactriana should have given to the West a sacred language and religion, Prof. C. de Harlez concludes : "*La solution la plus simple et la plus naturelle serait d'attribuer l'Avesta aux Mages et à la Médie.*"² (H. I, p. xlv.)

The assertion that Bactriana was "*toujours soumise et peu important*"³ can hardly be correct. The large revenue obtained from this province in the time of the Achaemenian kings, proves at least that it was highly prosperous.⁴ That its population formed no inconsiderable part, but rather

¹ ["That Vishtāspa caused all the works written in the language of the Magi to be collected in order to acquire the knowledge of the Mazdian law." *Tr.*]

² ["The solution would be the simplest and most natural if we should ascribe the Avesta to the Magi and to Media." *Tr.*]

³ "Always subject to a foreign ruler, and of little importance."

⁴ [Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. IV. ch. 5, pp. 18-19. *Vide* Eng. ed. bk. VII, ch. II. pp. 23-24 : "The nations and condition of Eastern Irān can be ascertained more clearly from the inscriptions of Darius. According to his inscription at Behistun, his empire in that direction comprised the Parthians, Sarangians, Areians, Chorasmians, Bactrians, Sogdiani, Gandarii, Sattagydae, Arachoti, and Sacae ; and to these the Idhus, i.e., the Indians on the right bank of the upper course of the Indus, are added in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Naksh-i-Rustam. Further information is preserved by Herodotus with respect to the tribute imposed by Darius on these nations. As these statements are undoubtedly derived from Persian tribute-lists, they serve to throw a side-light on the state of civilization existing in the East of Irān at the division of the sixth

the main portion, of the Irānian people, is most clearly proved by the energetic opposition offered to Alexander the Great precisely in the North-Eastern provinces of the Persian empire. Moreover, I must here repeat that, in determining the home of the Avesta religion generally, the question is not one respecting Bactria alone but the whole of Eastern Irān.

Again, we cannot attach much value to the statement that Khosru Parviz characterizes the Avesta language as the language of the Magi. There is no doubt that under the Sassanidae the Magi were the representatives of the Zoroastrian priesthood; but by this time the Avesta language had long been dead and had been succeeded in general use by the Middle Irānian. If, then, the Magi alone still understood this language, if they used it in their daily ceremonies, prayers, and recitations, and if it completely swayed the *cult* upheld by the Magi, it might well be called, for the sake of convenience, the "language of the Magi." Consequently, it is characterized as the language of a single order, not as that of a nation, just as Latin in the Middle Ages might be called the language of *literati* or Modern French the language of diplomacy.

Moreover, I generally accept the view of Prof. Harlez: The Achaemenian kings, and for the most part the Persian nation itself, did *not* profess the Zoroastrian religion. It is represented in historical times by the Median Magi, through whose influence it strove to gain ground among the majority of the Persians under the sovereignty of the Achaemenidae. But hence it has been inferred only of late, that the Magi composed the Avesta known to us, and that Zarathushtra himself was a Magus. This is only one of three possibilities. Besides this there are two other credible suppositions:—(a) The Magi adopted the doctrine of the Zoroastrian priests, thus representing a later phase in the development of the Avesta religion. (b) The Zoroastrian priests are the heirs of the Magi.

The last possibility we may briefly dismiss. We can trace the history of the Magi down to the Sāsānian period. But nowhere do we find any reference to a belief that they had delegated their peculiar office to another religious corporation, which revered the Zoroastrian doctrine and perhaps only transferred the scene of their labours to a different field.

As regards Prof. Harlez's theory that the Avesta was composed by the Magi and in Media, a very important fact seems to contradict it. The Avesta and fifth centuries B.C. The Bactrians, the twelfth satrapy of the empire, paid (yearly) 360 (Babylonian) talents into the treasury of the king. These sums which do not include the whole of the burdens of the provinces, but are only the land-taxes which they had to pay—in addition tolls were levied and contributions in kind to the court of the king and the satraps, as well as for the maintenance of the army—show that at the time of Darius agriculture and wealth had proceeded far beyond the earliest stages in the eastern districts of Irān. The Babylonian silver talent amounted to more than 2,000 thalers (6,000 shillings)." *Tr. n.*]

priests are not strictly called *Maghu* but *Āthravans*. In all passages where the priests are mentioned, they invariably bear this name ; and such passages are not few in number. Their testimony would lead us to infer that “*Āthra-van*,” and in fact this title exclusively, served as the official designation of the priesthood. Why then should the Magi in their own writings have given to themselves any other name than that by which they were universally known to the world ?

Now, in a passage in the Avesta (Ys. LXV. 6) there, indeed, occurs the expression *moghu-tbish* and this must be taken into consideration.¹ But what does it prove ? At the very most, only this, that, at the time when this passage was composed, the term *Maghu* was not unknown and perhaps was almost synonymous with *Āthra-van*. The fact that *Āthra-van* was the *real title* of the Avesta priesthood, is not in the least affected by the use of the term *Maghu*. Had the Magi really been the authors of the Avesta, their own title, instead of appearing only in a single isolated passage, and that the least important, would have been used throughout the work.

Moreover, it seems quite possible that, in the passage referred to, *Maghu* bears a purely generic meaning. If we compare it with the Sanskrit *magha-van*, the word can be translated “protector, or feudal lord, prince, nobleman.” *Moghu-tbish* occurs especially in Ys. LXV. 6, side by side with *hashē-tbish varezānō-tbish*, *nāfyō-tbish*, “the hatred of friends, free commoners or countrymen, and of relations.” These expressions are all generic terms, and we must of course admit that the context does not compel us to adopt the rendering of “priest” for *Maghu*, which is possible, though not always exclusively appropriate.

But we may ask, which of the two designations *Maghu* or *Atharvan* (*Āthra-van*) seems to be the older one ? *Atharvan* admits of a direct connection with the Vedic civilization. In the Rig-veda, too, we find the word *Atharvan* used to mean “a fire-priest,” as well as the name of a mythical character, the Prometheus of the Indians, who brings down fire from heaven, and is thus the prototype of all fire-priests on earth.² The title *Atharvan* may, consequently, be traced to the remote Arian period ; at the same time we can only discover Indian words, indeed analogous to *Maghu*, but not quite identical with it.

¹ Cf. H. 2, p. 171 ; also my *O. K. A.* pp. 489-492, (vide supra pp. 330-333). It will be observed that I have altered the views expressed in my *Ostirānische Kultur*, since I have there attempted to adopt a middle course.

² Comp. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 464-465, (supra pp. 309-310). It cannot, however, be proved that the title *Atharvan* is strictly meant by the name *πῦρξιδός* by which, according to Strabo (p. 733, where also the Cappadocians are specially mentioned), the Magi are supposed to have called themselves. Nevertheless, it does not do away with the fact that *Maghu* is unknown to the Avesta as the title of its priesthood (H. 2, p. 171).

Thus all evidence goes to show that *Atharvan* was the oldest and most original title of the Zoroastrian priesthood. Gradually, as the centre of gravity of the Irānian nation moved from East to West, as the Indian tribe of the Magi assumed the direction of religious matters, its name, which had an ethnographical significance at first, became at the same time the title of the priesthood formed by that tribe.

The Avesta, therefore, does not recognize the term *Maghu* as the title of the Zoroastrian priests; it never designates them by any other name than that of *Āthrauans*. On this point, even at the present day, a futile attempt is made to urge another passage from our text in support of the Median and Magian origin of the Avesta. This much-disputed passage (Ys. XIX. 18) runs as follows¹:—

“Who are the chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the country-prince, the fifth is the *Zarathushtra*. (So it is) excepting the *Zarathushtrian Ragha*. Who are (here) the chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the fourth is the *Zarathushtra*.”

What we may safely infer from the above passage is, that, at the time it was written, a kind of Zoroastrian papacy existed in Irān. To the High-priest was then assigned a rank higher than that of the country-princes. In *Ragha* he evidently possessed temporal as well as spiritual dignity. The High-priest of *Ragha* was at the same time its prince.

In the first place, however, it may be observed that the passage contains no personal reference to *Zarathushtra*; accordingly, it cannot serve as an argument in support of the theory that the Avesta was composed by the Medes. Apparently, *Zarathushtra* here is not a proper name but a generic term; it is the title of the head of the Zoroastrian priesthood. In the Pahlavi translation of the Avesta we find *Zarathushtrum*, “the highest *Zarathushtra*.”

Secondly, we must not bring the contents of the passage in Yasna, XIX 18, to bear on the whole period of the civilization of the Avesta people. Moreover, there are many other passages² besides this, which enumerate the different lords, but in none of them is the *Zarathushtrōtema* directly mentioned.³

¹ Spiegel has discussed this passage in his *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. III. p. 563; also Sp. I, pp. 9-10; Sp. 2, pp. 630-632. But, I believe, he is wrong, when, in connection with this passage, he quotes the epithet *thrizantu*, which *Ragha* receives in Vd. I. 16. *Zaantu* cannot possibly mean “order.” It means always “tribe, race,” and *thrizantu* must imply that three Irānian tribes had settled in the district (*dānu*) of *Ragha*.

² Cf. Yt. X. 18, 83; Vd. X. 5; Vsp. III. 2, &c.

³ Gāh, IV. 6-7. Here we meet with the following expressions in invocations and hymns of praise:—*Zarathushtrōtema*, *zarathushtra*, *āthrauan*, *rathazshtr*, *vāstrya-fshuyās*, *nmānō-paiti*, *vīspaiti*, *zantu-paiti*, *dānu-paiti*. From this we should gather that *Zarathushtra* as well as *Zarathushtrōtema* was a priestly title.

The superiority of the priesthood over the two other orders of warriors and farmers appears so very conspicuously throughout the Avesta, and so much attention is drawn to it by its author, that it is hardly possible he could have failed to emphasize the rank of the high-priest of Ragha beyond that of the tribal chiefs and the country-princes.

But it is quite unwarrantable to identify the temporal power of *Zarathushtra* in Ragha with the dignity of the Grand Magus in Rai, (Sp. 2, pp. 629-630). Such a theory fails in the most important point of our argument; the Avesta speaks only of the *Āthravans* and not of the *Magi*. It calls the high-priest of Ragha, *Zarathushtra* or *Zarathushtrōtema*, a title which is never given to the *Masmaghāns*. To this it must be added that the only authorities for the dignity of the Grand Magus in Rai, are Albērūnī and Yāqūt, and that the period in which it originated cannot, therefore, be ascertained. In determining the age of the Avesta, the reference to the *Masmaghān* must, in any case prove of little value. For, if the *Magi* were the heirs and successors of the Zoroastrian *Āthravans*,—a fact which must at least be generally admitted as possible—the *Masmaghān* to a certain extent would be a later development of the *Zarathushtrōtema* whose dignity might then be traced probably to the pre-historic epoch.

But I believe that we are not justified in laying too much stress on the passage, Ys. XIX. 18. We must not suppose that during the greatest part of Avesta epoch there existed any such half-spiritual, half-temporal power in Ragha. Who knows when this isolated passage was composed and when it was introduced into the text? Had Ragha really played so important a part in the Zoroastrian commonwealth, it is strange that this city is named only in two passages in the whole Avesta, viz., (1) in the passage cited above, and (2) in the list of countries enumerated in the Vendidad. *Haitumat* is mentioned three times; *Haraiva* and *Moru* twice; whilst such places as *Aryana-vaija*, the *Hara-berzati*, the *Ardri-sura*, and also the *Rangha*, are frequently mentioned. Surely nobody will be inclined to assert that in the Avesta opportunities could not have offered themselves for mentioning Ragha and the high-priest residing in it.¹

IV. The Avesta commends next-of-kin marriage as a meritorious institution. But this practice, according to Herodotus, III. 34, was only introduced by Cambyses. The Avesta, therefore cannot have been composed until after Cambyses.

¹ Other passages of the Avesta have been pointed out (cf. *O. K. A.* pp. 489-490; vide above pp. 331-332) from which we can infer that the *Āthravans* "came from afar" and led a wandering life. This may be true even of several districts, and of certain portions of the Zoroastrian priesthood; but it does not follow hence that the *Āthravans* were identical with the *Magi* and had emigrated from West to East.

I believe that we should not press too far this assertion of Herodotus, which has the air of an anecdote. It is of course improbable that such an institution could have been introduced, in an age of relatively high civilization, by the mere edict of a single individual, and even obtain recognition as a moral law. How could the Median Magi have reconciled themselves to the thought of adopting such an innovation, in opposition to their usual practice, at the time when, as Prof. Harlez assumes, they were opposed to the Persians? It is, however, far more probable that they would have used such an innovation as a ground of opposition to the king. The statement of Herodotus has, apparently, no other object than to give an explanation of some kind or other for an existing custom naturally unfamiliar to him. It certainly has no historical value. Moreover, it must be added that Herodotus expressly says:—Οὐδ'αμὼς γὰρ ἐώδεσαν πρότερον τῇσι ἀδελφεῇσι συνοιχεῖν Πέρσαι. At the most we can only consider the innovation of Cambyses as affecting the Persians, a fact which cannot in the least influence the question whether the Median Magi had already in olden times recognized and approved of the marriage of relations.

I can dispose with equal ease of the next objection set forth by Prof. Harlez.

V. The fifth Yasht could not have been written before the introduction of the cult of the *Anāiti* by Artaxerxes Mnemon. The description which comprehends the outward figure and garments of that *yazatu* in the Yasht, seems to be exactly that of a statue of *Anāiti*.

This conclusion is evidently erroneous. Granted that Artaxerxes II. (404-361) had actually introduced the cult of the *Anāiti*, his action could have reference to Persia alone. Again, the Median Magi, who, according to Prof. Harlez, endeavoured during the sovereignty of the Achaemenidae to propagate their religion over the whole of Irān, might have worshipped their *Anāhita* many centuries before. But, as far as I know, it is nowhere asserted that Artaxerxes II. first instituted this cult. Berosus alone relates that Artaxerxes II. was the first to set up images of the Aphrodite *Anāiti* in different towns, and that before this the divine beings were never represented in Irān in any shape whatever.¹ Thus we have here only a question of the erection of statues and especially of that of Aphrodite *Anāiti*, that is, of a female deity in whose worship the old Irānian conceptions were blended with Semitic ideas.

Then, as regards the description of *Anāhita* given in the fifth Yasht (par. 126-129), it is more probable that the later images of *Anāhita* were adapted to such frequent delineations, than the reverse. Every image must, however,

¹ Clements Alex. *Admonit. Adv. Gentes*. Comp. Spiegel, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. II. p. 56, note 1.

first exist in the mind before it can receive material expression. Again, Prof. Harlez's theory is not justified by the opening words *yā hishtaiti* "which stands in a certain place." This is sufficiently manifest from the glowing character and internal evidence of the whole description, which is an effort to describe in life-like terms the form of that *yazata*.

VI. I have already spoken briefly of the linguistic evidence adduced by Prof. Harlez in the sixth passage. Dr. Spiegel, too, admits that we are not justified in laying any stress upon it. We should also reject it on the ground that the Avesta, as we have it, cannot be supposed to be exactly in its original condition. And, in fact, this is confirmed not merely by the Zend Grammar in which many forms adapted from modern dialects may be often observed, but also by the mere form and spelling of the words.¹

VII. The persecutions alluded to in the Gāthās refer to the persecutions of the Magi by king Darius.

This view is opposed by the whole tone and tenour of the Gāthās. Prof. Harlez has overlooked the fact that the opposition here described does not merely imply the conflict between two different religious factions or sects, but at the same time that between two different epochs of the economic history of the Avesta people. On the dispute between Darius and the Magi hinged, however, the question of legal power and not that of economical grievances. Let us only read the twenty-ninth chapter of the Yasna. In fact, I do not understand how the cow can become the representative of the Magi and pray for them to Ahura Mazda for their deliverance from the oppressions of Darius. Nor can I conceive how the appearance of Zarathushtra could be the promised help they had in view. That would be true, however, for the Magi of the Achaemenian period *tempi passati*. Moreover, all this is easily explained on the supposition that the hymn in question relates to the herdsmen and agriculturists of Eastern Irān, who were oppressed by the nomads of the steppes, and was composed in the age of Zarathushtra.² The Prophet

¹ Cf. J. Darmesteter, *Études Iraniques*, I. p. 10, (Paris, 1883).

² In this respect the circumstance that the Avesta, as it seems to be assumed generally, was originally written in a different and ambiguous alphabet, similar to the Pahlavi, must have had a peculiarly injurious effect on the form of the text. We may thus account for the vagueness in the nature and constitution of the vowels, for the different ways of writing the *guna* forms, and the interchange of long and short vowels, &c.

³ I cannot at all conceive why Zarathushtra should not be regarded as a historical personage; historical, of course, in the sense in which Lycurgus is historical. Much less can I believe in a "mythological" connection with the Rig-veda, which Dr. Spiegel believes he has established by deriving the name *Spitamā* from the root *spit*, and by identifying it with the Vedic *çvitṛ*. But all this proves only an etymological affinity, as well as the use of the root *çvit* by Indians and Irānians in the formation of proper names; but certainly nothing more. The name *Spitamā* can be traced historically in Irān. Let us only consider the name *Spitamenes*, and we are reminded of the fact that he was an Eastern Irānian! Cf. Sp. I, pp. 8-9.

may have been honoured as the principal defender of the menaced peasantry or country-people.

How can we account for the absence of all historical references in the *Gāthās* which allude to so many incidents of real life ? Are we to suppose that the author must have taken special care to avoid every hint which might enlighten the reader or the hearer as to what is particularly referred to ? The names of opponents, however, could not have been omitted, nor the honourable mention of the most faithful of the *Magi*. But the reverse is the case in the *Gāthās*. Here there is only a general record of the opposition between what is good and what is evil, between the believing and the unbelieving, so that we can obtain no definite knowledge of the personages concerned ; or, where the narrative treats of real life, the object of all enmity, all care, prayers and apprehensions is nothing else than the cow.

As the last argument in support of the modern origin of the *Avesta*, Prof. Harlez alleges the words of foreign origin, which only found their way at some later period into the language. I have already discussed this question above, and, with the assistance of M. Halévy, more fully in fact than Prof. Harlez himself has done.

In conclusion I have to make two more observations.

It might perhaps strike the reader that I have not here touched upon the theory which supposes the *Vishtāspa* of the *Avesta* to be merely identical with the father of *Darius Hystaspes*. I did not mention it, not because it has found scarcely any supporters, but because of another reason which is, indeed, a very simple one. There are not two opinions as to the identity of the two names, *Vishtāspa* and *Hystaspes* ; but such an identity cannot, therefore, be used as a proof in determining the question of the age of the *Avesta*, since it does not at all involve any identification of the personages to whom the names belong. History tells us of several *Hystaspes*. But that the father of *Darius* must have been the very prince named in the *Avesta*, who embraced the doctrine of *Zarathushtra*, is by no means proved. It is merely a possibility, an hypothesis, which requires to be independently proved. Moreover, a proof in support of it could only be supplied by first endeavouring to determine the date of the *Avesta* from internal evidence. This theory, therefore, cannot form a link in the chain of arguments for or against the great antiquity of the *Avesta*, for this reason, that it is only an assumption. It is more likely that, according to the result arrived at from those arguments, the question as to the relation of *Vishtāspa* to *Hystaspes* might open out a new field for investigation. In my opinion, it is evident that the *Vishtāspa* of the *Avesta* has nothing in common with the father of *Darius* but the name, which both may have shared with several other *Irānians*.

Finally, it is sometimes asserted that the Avesta can be of no great antiquity, because the doctrines and ideas contained in it are too noble and elevated to have been developed among the Avesta people, who had not passed the primitive stage of civilization. Such general assertions cannot of course be proved or contradicted. It is more or less a question of taste. Moreover, I believe, that such assertions would lead one to overestimate the sublimity of the Avesta conceptions as regards the Spirit. The æsthetic value of the Avesta is generally supposed to be far below that of the Rig-veda. But it must be remembered that the Vedic Arians were as conspicuous for their poetic ideas and artistic taste, as the Irānians were distinguished for their profound moral virtues. This might also easily be explained from the physical condition of the Irānian soil, which necessarily accustomed its inhabitants to a rigid ideal of life, to hard work and industry, which, though it probably restrained the flight of fancy, nevertheless ennobled human nature.

Who, again, can say how far the personal influence of the founder of the Avesta religion may have reached? The intellectual development of man cannot be regulated at will. If it seems to stagnate for centuries, it often, on the contrary, makes gigantic strides in one single generation. and that, too, owing to the personal influence of a single individual.

The question as regards the home and age of the Avesta is at present the standing difficulty of Irānian Philology, and will, I surmise, remain so for a long time. I shall be content with what little I can contribute towards the legitimate solution, which must eventually discover the truth.

So long as no new and convincing reasons are adduced on the other side, so long as the arguments I have striven to bring together in my work remain un rebutted, I repeat, in concluding this treatise, the convictions with which I set out, namely, that : -

1. The home of the Avesta civilization was really Eastern Irān, the land of the Syr-darya westward towards the frontiers of Media and southward to the deserts of Gedrosia.
 2. The Avesta civilization dates from a very remote antiquity. It is fruitless to specify a particular century. But there is no doubt that it is older than Medo-Persian history.
-

[This opinion of Dr. Geiger has been ably supported by the accomplished Avesta scholar, Dr. Karl Geldner, in his dissertation (*vide* "Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th ed. vol. XVIII. p. 653) on the old Irānian languages and literature, from which I extract the following :—

Persian (Irānian) Languages.

"The Irānian family of languages is one of the seven great branches of the Indo-European stem, and was first recognized as such by Sir William Jones and Friedrich Schlegel. Whatever uncertainty still remains as to the exact relationship between all the several branches of the Indo-European family, it is at least certain that Indian and Persian belong together more closely than the rest, and that they continued to develop side by side for a long period after the other branches had been already severed from the parent stem."

* * * * * * *

"Our knowledge of the Irānian languages in older periods is too fragmentary to allow of our giving a complete account of this family and of its special historical development. It will be sufficient here to distinguish the main types of the older and the more recent periods. From antiquity we have sufficient knowledge of two dialects, the first belonging to Eastern Irān, the second to Western."

1. *Zend, or Old Bactrian*.—"Neither of these two titles is well chosen. The name Old Bactrian suggests that the language was limited to the small district of Bactria, or at least that it was spoken there; which is, at the most, only an hypothesis. *Zend*, again (originally *Azintish*), is not the name of a language, as Anquetil Duperron supposed, but means "interpretation" or "explanation," and is specially applied to the medieval Pahlavi translation of the *Avesta*. Our "*Zend-Avesta*" does not mean the *Avesta* in the *Zend* language, but is an incorrect transcription of the original expression "*Avistāk-va-Zand*," i.e. "the holy text (*Avesta*) together with the translation." But, since we still lack sure data to fix the home of this language with any certainty, the convenient name of *Zend* has become generally established in Europe, and may be provisionally retained. But the home of the *Zend* language was certainly in Eastern Irān; all attempts to seek it further West—*e.g.*, in Media¹—must be regarded as failures.

"*Zend* is the language of the so-called *Avesta*,² the holy book of the Persians, containing the oldest documents of the religion of Zoroaster. Besides this important monument, which is about twice as large as the *Iliad* and

¹ Cf J. Darmesteter, *Études Iraniques*, I. p. 10, (Paris, 1883).

² As was said above, this, and not *Zend-Avesta*, is the correct title for the original text of the Persian Bible. The origin of the word is doubtful, and we cannot point to it before the time of the Sassanians. Perhaps it means "announcement," "revelation."

Odyssey put together, we only possess very scanty relics of the Zend language in medieval glosses and scattered quotations in Pahlavi books. These remains, however, suffice to give a complete insight into the structure of the language. Not only amongst Irānian languages, but amongst all the languages of the Indo-European group. Zend takes one of the very highest places in importance for the comparative philologist. In age it almost rivals Sanskrit; in primitiveness it surpasses that language in many points; it is inferior only in respect of its less extensive literature, and because it has not been made the subject of systematic grammatical treatment. The age of Zend must be examined in connexion with the age of the Avesta. In its present form the *Avesta* is not the work of a single author or of any one age, but embraces collections produced during a long period. The view which became current through Anquetil Duperron, that the *Avesta* is throughout the work of Zoroaster (in Zend, *Zarathushtra*), the founder of the religion, has long been abandoned as untenable. But the opposite view, which is now frequently accepted, that not a single word in the book can lay claim to the authorship of Zoroaster, also appears on closer study too sweeping. In the Avesta two stages of the language are plainly distinguishable, for which the supposition of local dialectic variation is not sufficient explanation, but which appear rather to be an older and a younger stage in the development of the same language. The older is represented in but a small part of the whole work, the so-called *Gāthās* or songs. These songs form the true kernel of the book Yasna;¹ they must have been in existence long before all the other parts of the *Avesta*, throughout the whole of which allusions to them occur. These *Gāthās* are what they claim to be, and what they are honoured in the whole Avesta as being—the actual productions of the Prophet himself or of his time. They bear in themselves irrefutable proofs of their authenticity, bringing us face to face not with the Zoroaster of the legends but with a real person, announcing a new doctrine and way of salvation, no supernatural Being assured of victory, as he is represented in later times, but a mere man, often himself despairing of his final success, and struggling not with spirits and demons but with human obstacles of every sort, in the midst of a society of fellow-believers which was yet feeble and in its earliest infancy. It is almost impossible that a much later period could have produced such unpretentious and almost depreciatory representations of the deeds and personality of the Prophet; certainly nothing of the kind is found out of the *Gāthās*. If, then, the *Gāthās* reach back to the time of Zoroaster,

¹ The Avesta is divided into three parts; (1) Yasna, with an appendix, Visparad, a collection of prayers and formulas for divine service; (2) Vendidad, containing direction for purification and the penal code of the ancient Persians; (3) Khordah-Avesta, or the Small Avesta, containing the Yasht, the contents of which are for the most part mythological, with shorter prayers for private devotion.

and he himself, according to the most probable estimate, lived as early as the 14th century B. C.; the oldest component parts of the Avesta are hardly inferior in age to the oldest Vedic hymns. The Gāthās are still extremely rough in style and expression; the language is richer in forms than the more recent Zend; and the vocabulary shows important differences. The predominance of the long vowels is a marked characteristic, the constant appearance of a long final vowel contrasting with the preference for a final short in the later speech.

Sanskrit.	Gāthā.	Later Zend.
<i>abhi</i> (near)	<i>aibi</i>	<i>aiwi.</i>
<i>ihā</i> (work)	<i>īzhā</i>	<i>izha.</i>

“The clearest evidence of the extreme age of the language of the Gāthās is its striking resemblance to the oldest Sanskrit, the language of the Vedic poems. The *Gāthā* language (much more than the later Zend) and the language of the *Vedas* have a close resemblance, exceeding that of any two Romanic languages; they seem hardly more than two dialects of one tongue. Whole strophes of the *Gāthās* can be turned into good old Sanskrit by the application of certain phonetic laws; for example:—

“*Maṭ · vāo · padāish · yā · frasrūtū · īzhayāo.*
Pairijasāi · Mazdā · ustānazastō.
Āt · vāo · ashā · aredrahyāchā · nemanghā.
Āt · vāo · vanghēush · mananghō · hunaretūtū,”

becomes in Sanskrit—

“*Mana vah padāih yā praçrūtā īhāyāh*
Parigachāi medha uttānahastah.
Āt va çtena adhrasyacha namasā.
*Āt vō vasor manasah sūṇṭyā.”*¹

* * * * *

“The phonetic system of Zend consists of simple signs which express the different shades of sound in the language with great precision. In the vowel system a notable feature is the presence of the short vowels *e* and *o*, which are not found in Sanskrit and Old Persian; thus the Sanskrit *santi*, Old Persian *hantiy*, becomes *henti* in Zend. The use of the vowels is complicated by a tendency to combinations of vowels and to epenthesis, i.e., the transposition of weak vowels into the next syllable; e.g., Sanskrit *bharati*, Zend *baraiti* (he carries); Old Persian *margu*, Zend *mōurvā* (Merv); Sanskrit *rinakti*, Zend *irinakhti*. Triphthongs are not uncommon; e.g., Sanskrit *açvebhyaḥ*

¹ “With verses of my making, which now are heard, and with prayerful hands, I come before thee, Mazda, and with the sincere humility of the upright man and with the believer's song of praise.”

(dative plural of *açva*, a horse) is in Zend *aspaēibyō* ; Sanskrit *kṛnoti* (he does) Zend *kerenaoiti*. Zend has also a great tendency to insert irrational vowels, especially near liquids ; owing to this the words seem rather inflated ; e.g., *savya* (on the left) becomes in Zend *hávaya* ; *bhrájati* (it glitters), Zend *bará-zaiti* ; *gnā* (γνώ), Zend *genā*. In the consonantal system we are struck by the abundance of sibilants (*s* and *sh*, in three forms of modification, *z* and *zh*) and nasals (five in number), and by the complete absence of *l*. A characteristic phonetic change is that of *rt* into *sh* ; e.g., Zend *asha* for Sanskrit *ṛta*, Old Persian *arta* (in Arataxerxes) ; *fravashi* for Pahlavi *fravardin*, New Persian *ferver* (the spirits of the dead). The verb displays a like abundance of primary forms with Sanskrit, but the conjugation by periphrasis is only slightly developed. The noun has the same eight cases as in Sanskrit. In the *Gāthās* there is a special ablative, limited, as in Sanskrit, to the “a” stems, whilst in later Zend the ablative is extended to all the stems indifferently.

“We do not know in what character Zend was written before the time of Alexander. From the Sassanian period we find an alphabetic and very legible character in use, and derived from Sassanian Pahlavi and closely resembling the later Pahlavi found in books. [The oldest known manuscripts are of the 14th century A.D.]”



Gushtasp and Zoroaster.*

WE can hardly treat of Gushtāsp¹ and his reign, without previously speaking of Zoroaster, not merely because the appearance of the Prophet is the most important event of that reign, but also because a great part of the incidents to be presently described would be unintelligible, if the acceptance of the religion of Zoroaster were not considered as a previous fact. For the first time we meet in these obscure ages with a personality of which we can ask, whether the historical character does not outweigh the mythological and legendary. Zoroaster is, further, a personage frequently named not only by Oriental, but also by Western authors. We are, therefore, obliged not to be contented regarding his career with the testimony derived from those sources, which we have before designated as the only Irānian traditions extant; but we must here add a few supplementary remarks on the authorities for our knowledge of the life of Zoroaster.

The name of Zoroaster was known to the Greeks and Romans, and is often mentioned by them as that of the founder of the Magian religion. If we approach the matter more closely, and enquire what those Greeks and Romans knew regarding him, we only find in each case notices which are not at all sufficient for a sketch of Zoroaster's life and work. Much less can we expect from the classical writers a description of those remote times wherein Zoroaster is said to have lived. There are, on the whole, only three writers of whom we can avail ourselves with regard to this question, namely, Herodotus, Berosus, and Ktesias. The two first are trustworthy authors and justly deserve to be relied upon; but Herodotus has not named Zoroaster at all, and Berosus, of whose writings we have only a few fragments, has perhaps mentioned him by name, but this cannot be affirmed with certainty. As regards Ktesias, his accounts are generally considered to be unreliable. So much may here be sufficient by way of preliminary remark concerning those writers of whom we shall speak more fully later on.

Our Oriental sources are far more complete than the Western ones, and also deserve to be described somewhat more in detail. In the Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions the name of Zoroaster is nowhere mentioned; and even if it be probable that he was already known in the time of Darius, such a belief will have to be proved from internal evidence. So frequently does the Avesta mention the founder of the *Mazdayasnān* religion, that it is self-evident that the accounts given in his book respecting the Irānian founder of religion, have for us a peculiar significance. With these accounts are linked those notices, partly also valuable, which are given in later Parsi writings on the life of

* Translated from the German of Dr. F. Von Spiegel, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. I. bk. II. chap. II. pp. 668-716.

¹ It is well known that this name takes the form *Vistāspa* in Old-Persian and Old-Bactrian, and is identical with the Greek form *Hystaspes*.

Zoroaster, and which must be at least partially based on more ancient accounts. The information afforded by Mahomedan writers, hitherto availed of, like Hamza and the author of *Mujmil*, is indeed not very copious, though not without some value. The same may also be said respecting the account of Shāhrestāni, who has noticed Zoroaster to some extent in his work on religious parties and philosophical schools.

Special attention, however, respecting this period must be paid to the Book of Irānian Kings, viz., the *Shahnāmah*. It must be observed that the particular sections, which describes the work of Zoroaster and a portion of the reign of Gushtāsp, does not belong to Firdūsi, but to the more ancient poet Dakiki, who had commenced to write this portion of the Book of Kings, but, owing to his violent death, was cut short in his work, before he had yet finished more than a thousand couplets. Now Firdūsi states that Dakiki appeared to him in a dream, and requested him to embody his unfinished work in the Book of Kings, with which request Firdūsi complied. This entire portion of the Book of Kings (which extends from page 1065 to 1108 of M. Macan's edition), cannot, therefore, be regarded as proceeding from Firdūsi. However, as Firdūsi does not express himself very enthusiastically regarding Dakiki in the concluding words to that part, it can hardly have been his veneration for the deceased poet, which prompted him to enlarge his work. The true reasons are not, however, difficult to penetrate. The secure position which Mahmud of Gazni had conferred upon the poet Firdūsi to enable him to finish undisturbed his great work, proved a source of envy to the courtiers. They attempted to raise suspicion against the poet in the mind of his patron, and especially maligned him by saying that his great enthusiasm for the traditional lore of the nation was due to his inclination towards the old religion of the country. The suspicion of not being an orthodox Moslem would have appeared monstrous in the eyes of so fanatical a king as Mahmud was, and for a poet made thus suspect a description of the life and acts of Zoroaster was an extremely delicate task. Firdūsi, by ostensibly taking up the work of his predecessor, which directly treated of that very life of the Irānian Prophet, evaded all difficulties. While he fully secured himself by that device, it cannot be denied that he also did his best for us.

As is well known Dakiki was never converted to Islāmism. He belonged to the old religion of the country, and had not the least reason to describe the life and the exploits of his Prophets otherwise than they were known to him. Consequently, we can believe ourselves entitled to consider the account of Zoroaster in the Book of Kings as a true representation of the view which people had at that time in Irān of the work of the Prophet, at all events a truer one than that which Firdūsi would have been able to offer or justified in offering. The peculiar features of this description by Dakiki are the Buddhist elements, which appear to have a place in the Zoroastrian belief, and

then again the hostile feeling against the religion of Zoroaster, which we shall treat of more fully in due course. It is as easy to explain the one as the other. We know that, in the period after Alexander, Buddhism was powerful in Eastern Irān, and that it counted its confessors as far as Taberistān. It is especially certain that many Buddhist priests were found in Bactria.¹ This state of things, which began perhaps in the first century before Christ, lasted till the seventh century A.D., when the appearance of Islāmism alone cut short the development of Buddhism in Kābul and Bactria; and it is in that period that we will have to place the rise of the Zarathushtra-legend in the form in which it is presented to us by Dakiki. It is natural enough that the adherents of the doctrine of Zoroaster did not regard with favour the astonishingly rapid progress which the Buddhist religion made in Bactria and the adjoining countries; but it is also obvious that in spite thereof they were inclined to accept several peculiarities of the new religion, when they found it convenient to do so. All these circumstances show that the Oriental legend of Zoroaster is throughout transmitted to us in its Bactrian form.

If we now consider more closely this remarkable character, who was destined to play so important a part in Irānian intellectual life,² we shall have to say a few words first with reference to his name. Among the ancients he usually appears under the name *Zorózdros*, and from this form has originated the current form Zoroaster, which name we have also here retained as thus generally intelligible. Only Diodorus calls him by the name of *Zθρζόστρης*³ probably on the authority of Ktesias. Among the later writers we also find the name-forms *Záρης*, *Zράδης*, and *Zρζρος*; but M. Windischmann appears to me to have proved that by the latter names is meant, not Zoroaster, but an Assyrian, who is said to have been the so-called teacher of Pythagoras. The most ancient Irānian form that we know of his name is pronounced *Zarathushtra*, and with it the Greek *Zoróζτρος* does not quite harmonize. It must be presumed that the Western nations had a somewhat different form of the name, which may perhaps have sounded *Zarashtra*, and from this we may trace its Greek version. All the Oriental forms of the name go back to the original *Zarathushtra*, by which the Armenian *Zardasht* may be accounted for. In Huzvaresh the forms are *Zertusht* and *Zartusht*; in Modern Persian the most usual are *Zardusht* and *Zarduhasht*. Other less common variations have been collected by M. Windischmann.⁴

It has been found not less difficult to arrive at the precise meaning of the name than it has been to fix its original form. The explanation transmitted

¹ Vide the proofs in Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumskunde*, II. p. 1075.

² For the following, compare Windischmann, *Zoroastr. Studien*, p. 44.

³ According to Lagard (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 47), it might be read *Xaothrausies* in Diodorus.

⁴ *Zärtusht*, *Zäräduhasht*, *Zärtusht*, *Zärhusht*, *Zarütusht*, *Zarädusht*, *Zartusht*, *Zärdusht*, *Zärduhasht*, *Zarähtusht*, *Zarahdust*, even *Zärdisht*, *Zardisht*, (*Zor. Studien*, p. 45).

to us by the ancients, which, it is presumed, proceeds from Deionon, and according to which the word signifies the same as ἀστροδαίτης, which Bochart supposed to be ἀστροδαίτης, has long been rejected as untenable. With regard to the explanation of the native form *Zarathushtra*, to which all attempts at interpretation are now entirely confined, no one has hitherto come to any conclusion, not even concerning the language according to which the name should be explained. Mr. George Rawlinson, however, has very recently attempted to explain it by means of the Semitic languages; assuming *Ziru Ishlar* as the original form, *Ziru* might be the Semetic זִירָע 'seed, descendant,' *Ishlar* the name of the planet Venus. Of course the explanation is nearer and more probable if one endeavours to interpret it through the Irānian languages, but, even with the aid of interpretations based on them, one cannot lay claim to absolute certainty. The explanation of Dr. F. Müller appears to me to be the most probable, according to which *Zarathushtra* would mean "possessing courageous camels."¹ The word should, on this supposition, be altered to *Zaratushtra*—the change of a *t* into *th* is likewise witnessed in the Gāthās in some other examples, especially in such words in which *a* follows *t*. Besides, other names also prove that the Irānians made use of the word *ushtra*, "camel," in the formation of proper names (for instance *Frashashtra*). As already said, even this interpretation is not perfectly reliable.

As regards the age in which Zoroaster probably flourished, we shall hardly be able to arrive at more certainty than in the case of his name and its meaning. To what period Zoroaster belongs, according to the view of Oriental authorities, is already known from our previous inquiries concerning the chronology of the legendary history regarding him. According to these authorities, Zoroaster belongs to the middle portion of the duration of the world since the creation of the human race, or 9,000 years after the creation of the

¹ [F. Müller, *Zendstudien*, part I., Vienna, 1863, pp. 3-7 :—

"The name of the great prophet of the Irānians, whom we commonly call Zoroaster, according to the Greek form Ζωροάστρης is pronounced *Zarathushtra* in the language in which he himself spoke. Its true etymological meaning is a matter of conjecture only.

"The modern adherents of the Prophet interpret the name, according to the modern Persian form *Zardusht* or *Zartusht*, (زر دشت—زرتشت) as meaning 'a gold star.' Should this explanation be traced to Old-Bactrian, in which *zairi* corresponds to the first part *zar*, 'gold,' while the name of the star *Tishtar* (تیشتر) must stand for the second part *tusht*, *dusht*, 'a star,' we must substitute for *Zartusht*, a different form, *zairitishtrya*, which bears but little resemblance to the real form of the name *Zarathushtra*.

"An etymology based on the form *Zarathushtra* itself, is given by Burnouf, the founder of Zend studies, (*Comm. sur le Yaçna* XII.), who analyzes the word into *zarath* and *ushtra*, and explains it by 'fulvos camelos habens.' Of these component parts the second can now be shown to have the meaning 'camel' in the stock of the Old-Bactrian language, and can also be compared with the second part 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 'horse' in analogous proper names

world. We also know that, according to Irānian dogmatics, a thousand years cannot yet have fully elapsed since his death, for otherwise a new pro-

such as *Vishtāspa*, *Keresāspa*, *Pourūshaspa*, *Hacchataspa*. However, as regards the first part *zarath*, Haug justly remarks that it cannot bear the meaning 'yellow' (for, as is well known, 'yellow' is denoted in Old-Bactrian by *zairita*, and in modern Persian by *zard*); but it must be the form of a present participle. (Old-Bactrian *zarat* = Skr. *harat*, *jarat*). Thus the meaning suggested by Burnouf is likewise inadmissible, on account of the objections to the first part of the compound name he suggests.

"Another meaning, which, if I mistake not, is suggested by Roth, is that of *Zarathustra* as 'a goldsmith.' But a two-fold objection, phonetic as well as practical, might be urged against it. If we adopt this meaning, we must divide the word into *zara* and *thushtra*, and explain *zara* to be 'gold.' However, this form cannot be proved to exist in Old-Bactrian, where the word for 'gold' is invariably pronounced *zairi* = Skr. *hari*. Again, the second part, *thushtra*, presupposes a violent contraction as well as a lengthening of the suffix, of the word *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* (*thworeshtar*); both these forms, moreover, have nothing analogous to them in Old-Bactrian. Now, as regards the practical objections, I believe, they are still weightier. As is well known the Avesta everywhere speaks only of three orders: priests (*𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀*), warriors (*𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌*), and husbandmen (*𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌*); but we do not find any mention of handicraftsmen in the oldest fragments, still less of artists who devoted themselves to the manufacture of such an article of luxury as gold [?]. Now if we suppose Zarathushtra to have received this name either on account of his own vocation or of that of his father, we shall have to make an assumption which is inconsistent with the sacred writings and external evidences, and which could only be based upon the etymology above proposed. We must, therefore, also reject this etymology, which identifies Zarathushtra as a goldsmith.

"A derivation founded on the analysis of the word into *zarath* and *ushtra* is proposed by Haug in his *Gāthās*, vol. II. p. 246. The first part admits of three significations: (1) 'growing old,' (Skr. *jarat*), which is rejected as being evidently inappropriate; (2) 'heart,' (Skr. *hṛd*); (3) 'praise-singing,' (Skr. *garat*). The second part *ushtra*, however, is not rendered by 'camel,' but explained to be a contraction of *uttara* 'excellent.' Zarathushtra, therefore, is either 'he who has an excellent heart,' or what seems better—'the excellent panegyric poet or singer,' according as we determine upon the one or the other meaning of the word *zarath*.

"Both these etymologies also present phonetic as well as practical difficulties. If we regard the former, the identification of *zarath* with *zarad*, and also of the latter with *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀* (*zeredhaēm*), is striking; for its identity with Skr. *hṛd* is disputed in the passages cited by Haug (*Yasna* XLIII. 11; XXXI. 1; *sās . mashya'shu . zarazdūtish*; —*yoi . zarazdō . aghen . Muzdāi*), wherein *zaraz* occurs as the first part of a composite word. We might suggest *haras* with the same, if not with greater justice (Benfey, *Glossar zum Samaveda*, p. 206). Again the identity of *th* with *d* still remains doubtful, even if we concede that *zaraz* and *hṛd* are identical.

"In just the same way it is difficult to identify *ushtra* with *uttara*, because, even if we allow the elimination of *a*, for which, indeed, there is no authority,—since this change is never witnessed in the suffix *tara*,—we should also expect the form *uṣtra*, just as *basta* = *bad* + *ta*, and *dasta* = *dath* + *ta*. It happens, however, that the form *zarathushtra*, as against the faulty *zarathustra*, is on the one hand attested as the correct one; while, on the other, it is only the former, and not the latter, that can be the result of new forms with *sh* or *t*.

"Besides these phonetic difficulties, there is also a practical one with reference to the name. When Haug interprets the name as 'an excellent praise-singer,' and therewith

phet should have already appeared.¹ That we cannot with such *data* undertake to describe chronologically the life of Zoroaster, needs no further proof. Let us see whether the accounts of our Western writers help us to any better result.

The age of Zoroaster has been of late the object of searching inquiries.² The oldest Western writer, who mentions Zoroaster, is Xanthus of Sardis, who is said to have placed Zoroaster 600 years (according to others 6,000 years) before the fall of Xerxes. Should the first of these statements be correct, Zoroaster must have flourished about 1080 years before Christ. As Pliny (*H. N.* XXX. 1, 2) informs us, Eudoxus and Aristotle place Zoroaster 6,000 years before the death of Plato (*i.e.* 6350 B.C.), while Hermodorus, who was a disciple of Plato, following Eudoxus and Aristotle, fixes upon 5,000 years before the Trojan war (*i.e.*, 6100 B.C.). With the latter statement Plutarch also agrees (the "*Isid.*" ch. 48), as well as Hermippus, according to the testimony of Pliny. Whether Berosus has named this Zoroaster must remain doubtful, and even if the name Zoroaster really occurred in his writings, he may not have meant thereby the founder of the Irānian religion, but as I believe, a king of the same name. M. Windischmann has already fully discussed³ the statement of Porphyrius, that Zoroaster was probably the

observes that the chanting of hymns in the Gāthās plays an important part, and that Zarathushtra appears himself as a poet, he of course speaks of the Prophet and of the religious founder. It must then be assumed that Zarathushtra was not the *real* name, but only a *title of honour* given to the founder of the Parsi religion; but this assumption is not confirmed by the sacred writings. If the name is not a mere title of honour but a real name which belonged to the Prophet from his childhood, such a supposition cannot be supported by any analogy; for, if we examine the old Persian proper names occurring in the Avesta and elsewhere, we do not find among them any which could have been formed in a similar way, especially taking into consideration Zarathushtra's high spiritual excellence.

¹ Some Christian writers, like Abul Faraj (Histdynast. ed. Pococke, p. 33), and Euty-chius (Annal od. Seldon, p. 262), affirm that Zoroaster lived under Smerdes and Cambyases. This opinion seems to originate from the Mahomadans, in which case perhaps 1,000 years might have elapsed before the appearance of Muhammed, perhaps the prophet whom the Irānians had expected at that period.

² Windischmann, *Zor. Studien*, pp. 270, 274, 279, 285, 291, 302; Rapp, *Zeitschrift der DMG.* vol. XIX. p. 22.

³ Windischmann, *Zoroast. Studien*, p. 261.

"The interpretation of the name Zarathushtra as 'the most excellent panegyric poet,' was later on abandoned by Haug himself, (Essays, 1st ed. 1862, p. 252, Note), who adopted another instead. According to this view the name may be supposed to mean 'the most excellent director or guardian.' In this case we have the first part *zarath*=Skr. *jarat* 'old,' whilst the second part bears the same meaning as above. Against this explanation the same difficulties may be urged as before; and we should certainly again set forth the same objections, were it not that Haug regards the name Zarathushtra as, indeed, only an appellation, perhaps denoting 'a high-priest,' But, according to this assumption, the proper name of the founder of the Parsi religion would then be quite unknown, which is plainly inconsistent with the testimony of the sacred writings and the oldest tradition of the Parsis on the one hand, and the history of different religions on the other. Again,

teacher of Pythagoras, and might be placed, therefore, in the sixth century before the Christian era. The same writer has also proved that *Záβpztos* named by Porphyrius cannot be our Zoroaster. Agathias tells us that Zoroaster lived under a king Hystaspes, but it is not clear whether the latter was the father of Darius or not. Naturally, Agathias here means Vishtāspa or Gush-tāsp; he may even have had before him the same legend respecting Zoroaster which we read at the present day. Suidas even distinguishes between two different Zoroasters, one of whom is said to have lived 500 years (5,000 years may be read) before the Trojan war; the other is said to have been an astronomer, who lived in the age of Ninus. On these statements of Suidas very little reliance can be placed. One here sees clearly that he found in his sources of information different statements respecting Zoroaster, which he was unable to reconcile with one another, and which he endeavoured to bring into harmony by distinguishing in this manner between two persons of the same name. How one should act on these contradictory testimonies, it is not difficult to indicate. Dr. Rapp¹ has justly remarked that the accounts which place the age of Zoroaster about 6,000 years back, are of little importance, since it is incredible that at that time chronicles could have been available, which safely followed up the history of the past five or six thousand years. These statements can thus prove no more than that even at the time when they were made, Zoroaster was not known to be a historical personage.

the existence of several Zarathushtras will have to be proved, a point which could neither be supported by the scriptures nor by the legends.

"My opinion is that in order to give a correct interpretation of the name, we must first analyze it into its elementary parts, and then try to justify our explanation by proper analogies. If we now examine the name, which is no doubt a compound word, we must unquestionably divide it into *zarath* and *ushtra*. The latter word can in this case, as elsewhere, only denote a 'camel,' while the form *zarath*, as Haug has already correctly observed, cannot but be a present participle.

"Thus the question is only one regarding the correct meaning. The simplest way would be to trace *zarath* to the Old Indian root *har* 'to take, to gain anything as booty,' and the word would then mean, just as *bharat-rāja* and *jamad-agni*, 'obtaining camels as booty' (cf. 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬀 'having horses won or conquered'). But I prefer to take *zarath* as a present participle from the root *har*=*ghar*, from which also comes the word *haras*, 'glowing fire,' then 'wrath' (*haras krodhanāma*). Accordingly, *Zarathushtra* must mean 'possessing courageous camels,' (compare 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬀 'having lean horses,' 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬀 'having shaggy horses'). This simple explanation is also intelligibly supported by the constant occurrence in Greek as well as in Persian, of such names as contain 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬀 'horse' in the second part. That the camel was a domestic animal like the horse, among the ancient Persians, appears most clearly from Vend. XV. 68 *seq.*; it was even regarded as a more costly animal than the horse. (Comp. Vend. XIV. 50-53).

"Now as regards the epithet 'courageous' applied to camels, I refer my readers to the excellent description of them in Tarafah Muallaqah, verses 11 *seq.*" *Tr. n.*]

¹ Rapp, *Zablm G.* vol. XIX. p. 25.

As regards the statements of Xanthus, their accuracy has been questioned, and though the reasons, which caused this doubt are not solid,¹ so much is indeed certain, that this chronology is not reliable. As Xanthus places Zoroaster 6,000 years before the expedition of Xerxes, we need not waste time on his statement; but more than this, even when he places him only 600 years before this period, it is still more than doubtful whether his historical proofs extended even so far back. There remains only Ktesias, according to whose statement Zoroaster seems to fall into the same period with Ninus. But, leaving aside the fact that the testimony of Ktesias is generally not much to be relied upon, we must also doubt whether he really meant the Irānian founder of religion by the Bactrian king Zoroaster, of whom he may have spoken, or only a king of that name. After a review of the different statements recorded in Western writings, it will not surprise any one, if we give it as our opinion that neither Occidental nor Oriental testimony yields us any sure ground on which to fix the age of Zoroaster. In this view MM. Gutschmid² and Rapp³ have already proceeded us.

Still more material than the question regarding the name and the period of Zoroaster, is that concerning his native country, on account of the important conclusions which can be drawn from the answer to the latter. However, it will scarcely be ever possible to arrive at quite a certain result on this point. We begin our review of the several notices which lie before us of the native land of Zoroaster, with the Westerns and especially with Ktesias, not only because he is one of the most ancient historians, but also because he has a certain importance from the fact that a number of other writers have followed him. According to the historical account of Ktesias, which Diodorus has preserved for us, Ninus is said to have, with 1,700,000 foot and 210,000 horse, invaded Bactria where the king of the land, Oxyartes, awaited him with 400,000 men. Victorious in the beginning, the Bactrian king had in the end to give way to superior power, and was obliged to retire to his capital, where he was then defeated by Ninus with the assistance of Semiramis. In the account of Diodorus there does not at all occur, as we find, the name of Zoroaster. It is true, the name of the Bactrian king does not everywhere appear as Oxyartes; several manuscripts also give instead Εξόρτης, other Χζόρτης and Ζζόρτης, but in none do we meet with Ζωροάστρης. Nor is it less probable that the name may have been thus pronounced originally. We still possess fragments of a historiographer, Kephalion,⁴ who has confessedly made use of Ktesias concerning the same story, and he expressly gives the name of king Zoroaster in a tradition at

¹ Windischmann, *Zoroast. Studien*, pp. 268-275.

² *Beiträge Zur Geschichte des alten Orients*, p. 90.

³ Rapp, *Ziddm G.* vol. XIX. p. 26.

⁴ Kephalion in Eusebius *Chron.* arm I, 43 ed. Aucher:—"Incipio scribere de quibus et alii commemorarunt atque inprimis Ellanicus Lesbios Ctesiasque Onidius, deinde Herodotus Alicarnassus. Primum Asiae imperarunt Assyrii, ex quibus erat Ninus Beli

least, to him who is called by Diodorus, Oxyartes. With him Eusebius¹ and Theo² agree. After them Arnobius³ and finally the Berosian Sibyl, whom we shall mention hereafter, also place Zoroaster in Bactria.

As all the reports just enumerated associate Ninus with a king Zoroaster, it appears, indeed, as though the name of Oxyartes had been erroneously substituted for that of Zoroaster in the text of Diodorus. That even Ktesias could have meant by the Zoroaster named by him the founder of the Irānian religion, can by no means be confidently asserted, as the entire narrative has evidently undergone transformation in a later age. This becomes extremely clear when we compare the text of Diodorus with that of Arnobius; they both refer to the same facts; but whilst, according to the story of the first, two kings fight against each other with overwhelming forces, according to the second, Ninus appears as the representative of the Chaldean, Zoroaster as that of the Bactrian Magi. Since, however, in the account of Diodorus there is no allusion to Zoroaster's religious character, in spite of its being really the most complete report, it appears to me very probable that the mention made by Ktesias was only with reference to a king Zoroaster, and that the same was changed later on into the Magus. Besides, there is to a certain degree an inconsistency in calling anybody a Magus and at the same time a Bactrian.

(filius), cujus regni aetate res quam plurimae celeberrimaeque virtutes gestae fuerunt. Postea his adjiciens profert etiam generationes Semiramidis atque (narrat) de Zoroastri Magi Bactrianorum regis debellatone a Semiramide; nec non tempus Nini LII. annos fuisse, atque de obitu ejus. Post quem quum regnasset Semiramis, muro Babylonem circumdedit ad eandem formam, quae a plerisque dictum est: Ctesia nimirum et Zenone Herodotoque nec non aliis ipsorum posteris. Deinde etiam apparatus belli Semiramidis adversus Indos ejusdemque cladem et fugam narrat, &c." "I proceed to write of matters which others also have treated, especially Ellanicus Lesbian and Ctesias the Cnidian, and also Herodotus of Halicarnassus. The Assyrians first ruled Asia. Among them was Ninus, son of Belus, during the time of whose reign the most numerous exploits were achieved and the most glorious virtues displayed. Next after these he mentions also the generations of Semiramis, and describes the rebellion against Semiramis of Zoroaster, the Magus king of the Bactrians. He says that the term of Ninus's reign was fifty-two years and speaks of his death. Semiramis reigned after him, and surrounded Babylon with a wall exactly as described by most authors, by Ctesias in particular, by Zeno and Herodotus and others after them. He moreover describes the preparations of Semiramis for the war against the Indians, her defeat and fight, &c.," This event is also recorded by Syncellus in quite a similar manner.

¹ Eusebius, *Chron.* IV. 35 ed. Aucher: "Zoroastres Magus rex Bactrianorum clarus habetur adversus quem Ninus dimicavit." "Zoroaster the Magus, king of the Bactrians, against whom Ninus fought, is considered famous." *Præp. Ev.* X. 9. "Over whom (the Bactrians) Zoroaster reigned."

² *Progymnast*:—"Zoroaster was the king of the Bactrians...."

³ Cf. Arnob. *adv. gent.* I. 5. :—"Ut inter Assyrios et Bactrianos Nino quondam Zoroastrique ductoribus non tantum ferro dimicaretur et viribus, verum etiam magicis et Chaldaeorum ex recondito disciplinis, invidia nostra haec fuit?" "Has this feud of ours been like the war between the Assyrians and the Bactrians under Zoroaster and Ninus, in which strength and arms were not only used but also incantation and the mystic arts of the Chaldeans?"

Hence I am inclined to doubt whether we can quote Ktesias as an authority for the opinion that Zoroaster had his home in Bactria. We must, however, admit that we are in no case inclined to rely much on the assertions of this historian.

Besides those already cited, there still remain some ancient authorities who regard Zoroaster as a Bactrian, without allowing one to affirm that they, too, have borrowed their statements from Ktesias. But such authorities belong to a late period. One of these is Agathias (L. II., 24 ed. Nieb.), another Ammianus Marcellinus (XXIII. 6. 32). Both these writers recognize in Zoroaster not a king but the founder of a religion; both place him under a king Hystaspes. The former observes that we cannot tell whether this Hystaspes was the father of Darius or not, the latter on the contrary explicitly calls him the father of Darius. It appears to me very probable, not to say certain, that both these authors had the knowledge which we still possess at the present day as to the life of Zoroaster, namely, the fact that he flourished under a king *Vishtāspa* or Gushtāsp. If Ammianus recognized in this *Vishtāspa*, Hystaspes the father of Darius, who was alone known to him, we think such recognition very natural, but just as incorrect as his representing Zoroaster as a Bactrian, because he heard that the latter had worked in Bactria.

Besides, it is not at all the general view of antiquity that Zoroaster was a Bactrian; a whole series of authorities look upon him as a Mede or a Persian. In support of the view that Zoroaster was a Mede the authority of Berossus may perhaps be cited. This writer has composed a work which is mentioned by the ancients under the title of *Χολδζικά* or *Βαβυλωνικά*. In estimating the value of this work of Berossus ancient authors are full of praise, in which modern writers also participate. An unfortunate fate has followed the book, not only in that it is lost, but also in the fact that the few fragments preserved are not transmitted to us in their original form, but have passed through several hands before reaching us. With justice does the latest publisher,¹ therefore, observe :—

“Fragmenta satis ampla prae ceteris servarunt Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Syncellus. Quorum tamen ne unus quidem ipsos Berosi libros inspexisse videtur (comp. M. von Niebuhr, Geschichte Assurs, p. 12). Syncellus ex Eusebio, vel secuti Eusebius sua hausit ex Africano; Africanus ex Alexandro Polyhistore, hic ex Apollodoro ut videtur. Eodem Polyhistore usus fuerit Josephus, etsi mentionem fontis injicere omisit. Clemens Alexandrinus ob oculos habuit Jubam Mauritanium qui Berosi librum in Assyriis historiis excerptis videtur. Igitur quum per tot manus migraverint quae ad nos perdurarunt fragmenta, haud miraberis variis modis verba Berosi deformata esse, cavendumque ne Beroso imputemus quae sunt imputanda excerptoribus.”

¹ Vd. C. Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* II. p. 496.

"Fairly large fragments have been preserved, especially by Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Syncellus. But not one of them seems to have examined Berosus' original works. Syncellus has borrowed from Eusebius, or like Eusebius from Africanus, Africanus from Alexander Polyhistor, and he apparently from Appolodorus. Josephus must have made use of the same Polyhistor, although he has omitted to mention his authority. Clemens Alexandrinus had before him Juba, the Mauritanian, who seems to have quoted from the book of Berosus in his Assyrian histories. As, therefore, the fragments which survive have passed through so many hands it is not to be wondered at that the words of Berosus have been mutilated in various ways, and care must be taken not to ascribe to Berosus what should be imputed to those who quote him."¹

It also appears that from this particular Berosus a Sibylla Berosiana, who ranks far lower than the former, is to be distinguished. Upon this our authority speaks as follows :—

"Dubium vix est, quin alium quandam Berosum Sibyllae patrem cum historico Justinus (cf. Justinus Martyr Cohort. c. 39) confuderit. Quem errorem facile excusaveris, si verum est, quod sane versimillimum est, ipsum Berosum Sibyllae istius Berosianae in historiis suis meminisse. Nam quae ex Sibylla narrat Alexander Polyhistor de turris Babylonicae aedificio vix aliunde quam ex Nostri libris petita fuerint."

"There is scarcely any doubt that Justin has confounded with the historian some other Berosus, the father of Sibylla. This error can easily be excused, if it be true, as seems indeed most probable, that Berosus himself has in his history made mention of that Sibylla, daughter of Berosus. What Alexander Polyhistor borrows from Sibylla, concerning the building of the Tower of Babylon, could scarcely have been collected from other sources than the books of our Berosus."²

Much more severely does M. von Niebuhr express himself :—"The extract concerning the Sibyl of the Tower ought to be strictly separated from those taken from Berosus, since it is not cited as a Berosian one. Nor should we allow ourselves to be deceived when Moses Chorenensis says, whilst quoting a similar passage, that the same is to be found in the Berosian Sibyl. Besides the confused legends, which connect Berosus with a Sibyl, there is no indication that the so-called Chaldean had any other than a Jewish origin."³

Now amongst the fragments which originate from the genuine Berosus, there is one in particular that must attract our attention. It is preserved for

¹ C. Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* II. p. 495.

² M. von Niebuhr, *Geschichte Assurs*, p. 470.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 491-494.

us in a two-fold, but somewhat contradictory form, first in the Armenian translation of Eusebius, and again in Syncellus. I quote here the passage in question as given in Petermann's translation¹ :—

“ From Xisuthros and from the Deluge and until the Marcians (Medians) took Babylonia, *Polyhistor counts on the whole 86 kings, and makes mention of every one by name from the works of Berosus, and the years of all these kings he comprises in a period of 33,091 years. After these kings, according to those writers, the Medians, as they were so powerful, collected an army against Babylon, in order to capture it, and to set up as rulers tyrants of their own. Then he determines also the names of the Median tyrants numbering 8 and their years 224, and again 11 kings and years 4, then also the tyrants of the Chaldeans, 49 kings and 458 years.*”²

The author mentioned by Syncellus differs from this on several essential points. While there are 49 Chaldean kings according to Eusebius, Syncellus only mentions two of them and names 84 Median kings, then Zoroaster and 7 Chaldean kings. Hence M. C. Müller says :—

“ *Qui apud Eusebium ponuntur octo tyranni Medi, numero respondent Zoroastro ejusque successoribus septem.*”

“ The eight tyrants found in Eusebius answer in number to Zoroaster and his seven successors.”

The number of years, however, does not correspond. Syncellus assigns to his Medians only 190 years, while Eusebius gives 224 to his eight Median kings. On this point M. von Niebuhr remarks as follows³ :—“ As regards the statement of Syncellus, that Polyhistor has called only the two first kings Chaldean and the remaining 84 Medians, the version of Eusebius is clearly the genuine one. Syncellus has evidently not transcribed from Eusebius, but from another chronographer, probably Africanus. The author may, like Syncellus, have passed over the second dynasty—Syncellus in that passage mentions the first dynasty as being followed by Zoroaster and a Chaldean dynasty—and may have brought the medians into the first dynasty in the place of the 84 kings whose names Eusebius has not given. However, this author, mentioned by Syncellus, may also have been honest, (which we would so much the more willingly believe, as he could scarcely have been anybody else than Africanus), and the Medians may have originated merely in a misunderstanding.” Further on M. von Niebuhr says regarding the reciprocal relation of the two accounts⁴ :—“ Evidently he (Syncellus) also admits in the place of the second Median dynasty of Berosus his 84 Median kings of the first

¹ The italicized words are not those of Berosus, but of Eusebius. They are given in Klammer as additions of the translator.

² Cf. Müller, *Hist. Græc. Fr.* II. p. 503.

³ Vide Müller, *Hist. Græc. Fr.* II. p. 493.

⁴ Rapp, *Zdm G.* vol. XIX, p. 28.

dynasty, and Zoroaster and his second dynasty of 7 Chaldean kings with 190 years' interval, in the abovementioned passage, in the place of the third and fourth dynasties of Berosus." This view appears to me, likewise, the most probable; yet there is no doubt, that we can also understand this matter, as M. C. Müller, in the passage quoted above, and after him Dr. Rapp¹ have done, *viz.*, that Zoroaster and the 7 Chaldean kings stand in the place of the 8 Medians of Eusebius. As we have nothing to do with Babylonian history this question has little importance for us. What principally interest us is the name Zoroaster; no matter whether Berosus meant by it a Median or a Babylonian king. It is proved at all events that the name Zoroaster already occurred at a very early period, and certainly in Media itself or westward of Media.

But the question now arises, whether we have a right to affirm that Berosus has mentioned the name Zoroaster. M. von Niebuhr believes, that Berosus has not done so, but I see no ground at all for this assumption. On the contrary, it appears to me quite possible that Africanus (or whoever else may have been the chronographer consulted by Syncellus) found the name Zoroaster in his evidently very hasty review of the notices of Berosus, introducing the same in his report, since Eusebius explicitly remarks, that Berosus has given the names of the Median kings. This is my principal ground for regarding the Zoroaster mentioned here as a Median, because it is nowhere stated that Berosus has also given the names of the Chaldean kings. On the contrary, this Median king, likewise the founder of the Irānian religion, named by Berosus, need not necessarily have been any other than the Bactrian king of the same name mentioned by Ktesias. In opposition to Berosus, the Berosian Sibyl, referred to by Moses of Khorni, actually places Zoroaster in Bactria, but it has been already remarked, that very little importance should be attached to that authority.

The remaining accounts by Western writers of the native country of Zoroaster may be briefly mentioned. The Greek writer Clemens Alexandrius calls Zoroaster sometimes a Persian and sometimes a Mede, whilst Suidas calls him a Perso-Median. The Armenian Moses of Khorni, who has chiefly consulted Greek writers in his historical works, makes him a contemporary of Semiramis; and calls him "the Magus and sovereign of the Medes." According to his statement, Semiramis is said to have appointed him a satrap (governor) over Nineveh and Assyria; later on they became enemies and Semiramis was obliged to flee from him to Armenia, where she was plundered and killed by one Ninyas of the Empire. Yet, in another passage, Moses corrects the Berosian Sibyl and observes that Zoroaster was not a king of Bactria, but of Media. According to the statements of Pliny the Elder, who must

¹ Mos. Khor. I. p. 87.

have obtained his materials from Hermippus, we should search for Zoroaster's native country still further West, that is in Prokonnesos. An account, which is handed down to us by Clemens Alexandrinus, mentions Zoroaster as having been born in Pamphylia, and says that he was identical with Her, the son of Arminius.

This much will be clear from these statements, *viz.*, that even with the help of the ancients we cannot arrive at a certain knowledge of the native land of Zoroaster. If we now turn to the accounts furnished by Oriental writers, we indeed find in them greater harmony, but scarcely any historical facts. They unanimously place the native land of Zoroaster in Western Irān; but most of them state that he had worked at least for some time in Bactria. From the searching inquiries which M. Windischmann has devoted to this subject,¹ it follows that Zoroaster is often called in the Avesta "the renowned in *Aryana-vaija*"; according to another idea, it is even said that he was in the celebrated Aryana-vaija. The dwelling of Pourushaspa, the father of Zoroaster, was situated, according to Vendidad, XIX. 15, near "*drejya paiti zbarahē*" (*zbarahi*), and we shall hereafter find that it cannot be at all doubted that this designation also may denote *Aryana-vaija*, for, according to Yt. V. 104, IX. 25, XVII. 45, the Prophet there offers sacrifices to several *yazatas*. In the passage Ys. XIX. 51, 52, Zoroaster is mentioned in connection with the town of *Ragha* (in Media): however, it should not be hence inferred that he was also born there.

The Bundelesh expresses itself more unequivocally than the Avesta. It asserts that Zoroaster was born near the river *Darja* (51, 3; 79, 9) and this river is situated (53, 5) in Aryana-vaija. In a passage further on (58, 5) this river is the largest of the Bāra rivers; I conjecture that by Bāra may be here understood the same as by *zbāra* in the Vendidad. Further on, again, the Bundelesh (70, 8) informs us that Aryana-vaija lies southward of Ātropātene, and may thus well be the territory which the medieval geographers call Arran, and which extends as far as the country of Tiflis. Taking this position into consideration, the Huzvaresh Commentary to Vd. I. 60 evidently explains Ragha by Ātropātene, but admits that others understand under that name Rai, where Zoroaster probably dwelt for some time. Yaqut, like Abulfeda, points to the town of *Urumia* as the birth-place of Zoroaster. Two less-known Mahomedan historians, who are quoted by Hyde (*Hist. Vel. Pers.* p. 318, ed. 2nd), adduce the so-called authority of Tabari to prove that Zoroaster was born in the land of the Philistines. One calls him a disciple of Esra, the other of Jeremiah. If we now collect the results of all these conflicting statements, we can arrive at no certainty as regards the native land of Zoroaster; the majority of writers endeavour, however, to place it altogether in the West, and not in the East.

¹ Windischmann, *Zor. Studien*, p. 47.

After disposing of these preliminary questions, we now turn to the history of the life of Zoroaster himself. Nobody will be surprised to find that the narrative of the life of a man, whose age and native land cannot be ascertained, is very legendary. For most of the legends even a foundation is wanting; most of them are to be traced to modern sources, and some of them even to very late writers. Neither the Avesta, nor antiquity, nor the Sassanian period, nor lastly Fīrdūsi, has bequeathed to us a complete description of Zoroaster's career, and we are hence obliged to rely upon the more modern legends, and to point for greater confirmation to the isolated passages which have been preserved to us here and there in more ancient writings; e.g. in the Avesta.¹ The entirely legendary character of the narrative of Zoroaster's life may be perceived from the mere fact, that his biography does not begin with his birth, but actually long before it, not only in the later legends but also in the Avesta itself. And it is true that this part of his life is not without importance. For the confessor of the *Mazdayasnīn* religion the birth and the works of Zoroaster are unquestionably the most important historical events. All the great exploits of the heroes of yore, of whom we have hitherto heard, have taken place mostly for this purpose, viz., to help to diminish to such an extent the sum total of evil, as to allow the good event following to take place. So early as after the death of the Primitive Bull, to the *Geush-urva* or *Goshurun*, that is, the "Soul of the Bull," (*vide Iran Alterthumskunde*, vol. I. p. 510) is shown Zoroaster, and the hope is held out to it that the Prophet will appear in future on the earth. For it was not possible to make Zoroaster proclaim the Law at any time on earth. Only after the marks of the equipoise had come to rule, and the forces of the good and the evil principles were balanced, could it be ordained to send Zoroaster into this world. How important Zoroaster was to Ahura Mazda and His plans is also perceived from Yt. V. 17.....

The family from which a personage like Zoroaster springs is of no less importance than the circumstances of his birth. As we shall shortly observe, Zoroaster is of kingly descent, and has, therefore, every right to be celebrated in the Irānian hero-legends, for, from his birth, he stands second to none of

¹ The principal authority for the circumstances of the life of Zoroaster is the *Zartusht-nāme*, the text of which was published in lithograph at Bombay. I use the English translation of that book by Eastwick, which is found printed in the book of Dr. J. Wilson, "*The Parsi Religion Unfolded*," p. 477. A *Vie de Zoroastre* (Life of Zoroaster) is given by Anquetil (*Zend Avest. I. 2*, pp. 1-70), another by J. Mœnant: *Zoroastre, Essai sur la philosophie religieuse de la Perse* ("Essay on the Religious Philosophy of the Persians") 2nd edition, Paris, 1857; both of these works are based on the above-named legend of Zoroaster. An unfinished sketch of the life of Zoroaster is given by Windischmann (*Zoroast. Studien*, pp. 44-56) and myself (*Sitzungsberichte der K. bayr. Academie der Wissenschaften*, Jan. 1867). A life of Zoroaster by Dastur Z. Behram (Bombay 1864), in Gujerati, is a translation of the *Zartusht-nāme* with some annotations [by Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjānā.]

the early heroes of royal lineage ; and a hero too he is, though of a different kind from his predecessors, but not, therefore, of lesser importance, since his agency is spiritual. To these heroic attributes we have to ascribe the fact that, according to Yt. XVII. 17-20,¹ *Angrō Mainyu* runs away at his birth, and acknowledges that none of the *yazatas* have the power to supplant him, save Zoroaster alone, who smites him with the *Ahuna-vairya* as his weapon. Hence his father *Pourushaspa*, according to Ys. IX. 42, is named together with such great heroes as *Yima Athwya* and *Kereshāspa*, for the heroes already named and others have only taken the lives of some of the evil monsters. But Zoroaster has, by the promulgation of the Law, brought it to pass, that all those demons, who, at an earlier period, had been roving bodily about this world, had to hide themselves together under the earth. The Huzvāresh Commentary says in Ys. IX. 46 :—

“ He broke the body of everyone who could make his body invisible ; whoever could not do this, broke it himself.—The breaking of the body implies the fact that no more sin can be henceforward committed in the body of a demon, though in the body of a beast or of a man such beings are still able to commit sin ”

After this it may be said that Zoroaster marks the close of the mythical age. For, since he came into this world, the appearance of demons with supernatural bodies and powers is no more possible ; thus, therefore, ends the necessity for the heavenly powers to develop such special strength ; the world may follow its regular course. These remarks sufficiently show what an important personage Zoroaster is, and that the race may be deemed highly respectable which is entitled to count him amongst its members. We also know that his father *Pourushaspa* was allowed to enjoy the honour of being called the father of Zoroaster for this special reason that he belonged to the most zealous adorers of *Haoma*. Besides this, the *Zartushī-nīme* traces the descent of Zoroaster from Faridūn. We know, however, that from this king not only Eraj, but also Selam and Tūr together

¹ Ashi Vanguhi spoke thus :—“ Who art thou who dost invoke me, whose voice is to my ear the sweetest of all that invoke me most ? ”

“ And Zarthushtra said aloud ! ‘ I am Spitama Zarathustra, who, first of mortals, recited the praise of the excellent Asha and offered up sacrifice unto Ahura Mazda and the Amesha-Spentas ; in whose birth and growth the waters and the plants rejoiced ; in whose birth and growth the waters and the plants grow ; in whose birth and growth all the creatures of the good creation cried out, Hail ! ’ ”

“ In whose birth and growth Angra Mainyu rushed away from this wide, round earth, whose ends lie afar, and he, the evil-doing Angra Mainyu, who is all death, said :—All the gods together have not been able to smite me down in spite of myself, and Zarathushtra alone can reach me in spite of myself. He smites me with the Ahuna Vairya, as strong a weapon as a stone big as a house ; he burns me with Asha-Vahishta, as if it were melting brass. He makes it better for me that I should leave this earth, he, Spitama Zarathustra, the only one who can daunt me.” *Vide Darmesteter.*

with their descendants derived their origin, so that this lineage is in itself not specially significant. Of greater importance is the fact that Zoroaster's descent is not merely traced from Faridūn, but also from Mānushchehr; he therefore, indisputably belongs through this extraction to the royal family of Irān. The genealogical table is given us in the *Bundehesh* (79, 5), and in a later prayer called the *Dhup-nireng* or *Fumigation-prayer*, and lastly by *Masudi*. According to these sources, the genealogical table may be exhibited in the following manner :—

<i>Bundehesh</i>	<i>Dhup-nireng</i>	<i>Masudi</i>	
Manoshchihr	Minochehr	Menouchehr	(منوچهر)
Dūrāsrūn	Durānsroun	Dourshrin	(دورشرین)
[Dūrāsrob]			
Rajan	Rezeshné	Irej	(ارج)
Ayazem	Ezem	Haizem	(هایزم)
Vidast	Vedest	Wandest	(واندمست)
Spetāmān	Sepetaméhé	Espimān	(اسپیامان)
Hardār	Herdaré	Herdār	(هردار)
Harshn	Herdereshné	Arhadas	(ارحدس)
[Hardarshn]			
Paitarasp	Petarasp	Bātir	(باتیر)
Chasnush	Chakhshenosh	Hakhish	(حخشیش)
[Chakhshnush]			
Haechadasp	Hechedasp	Hejdasf	(هجدسف)
Spitarasp	Orouedasp	Arikdasf	(اریکدسف)
[Aurvadasp]			
.....	Peterasp	Federasf	(فدراسف)
[Paitirasp]			
Purushasp	Poroshasp	Bourshasf	(بورشسف)
Zartusht	Zartusht	Zarādusht	(زرادشت) ¹

Whilst the first row from Zoroaster to Māneschihr counts 13 members, the second one represents 14, the name Orouedasp (*Aurvat-asp*) being there

¹ [This genealogy is somewhat differently given in the *Dinkard*, bk. VII., as well as in the text of the *Vajarkarde-dini* (pp. 28, 29) published by Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana in 1848 (*Cf.* "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 141, by Dr. West) :—

"Pōrūshasp son of Paitiritrāsp, son of Urugadasp (Urva-dasp), Haechadasp, Chikhshnush, Paetrip (Paretirasp), Areja-darshne (Hardarshn), Hardār, Spitāmān, Vaedeshta, Nyāzem, Airij (Razishn), Dūrāsrōban, Mānūshchihr ruler of Irān, Mānūshkhūrñār, Mānūshkhūrñāk, Nēryōsang, Varzidedin, Vizāk, Airyāk, Ithritāk, Ibitāk, Frazishāk, Zīshāk, Frasizāk, Izāk, Airij, Faredun lord of Qaniras, Pūrtōrā Āspigān, Nevaktōrā Āspigān, Sōgtōrā Āspigān, Gefartōrā Āspigān, Vanoifravashn Āspigān. Yima lord of the seven regions, &c." *Tr. n.*]

inserted. We also observe that the second row contains the name Peterasp twice, once in the usual place corresponding with that which it holds in the Bundeshesh, and the second time immediately before Purushaspa in the place where the Bundeshesh reads Spitarasp; the latter reading may be the correct one. Masudi agrees with the second table. M. Windischmann has already proved that the Avesta gives to Zoroaster the same line of ancestors. It is true that, though not all, yet several names of the ancestors do occur, most frequently *Spitama*, next *Chakshni* (Yt. XIII. 114), *Haechat-aspa* (Ys. LII. 3), while *Pōrushaspa* also is frequently called the father of Zoroaster. We can here even point out, as far as is needful, his collateral relations. The Bundeshesh informs us (79,8) that Paitirasp or Spitarasp had two sons—the one was Pourshasp, the father of Zoroaster, the second was Ārāsta from whom a son Maidhyōmāh descended, and his account is confirmed by Yt. XIII. 95, where we find mention made of *Maidhyōmāh*, son of *Ārāsta*. The mother of Zoroaster, according to the Bundeshesh and the Zartushtnāme, is named Dughdha,¹ and her parents, according to the book first-named, Frahi and Mrava, names which are not to be found again in the Avesta. By this genealogy the royal descent of Zoroaster is at all events established beyond question.

Not merely a kingly, but to a certain extent a divine, origin is ascribed to Zoroaster in an account which we find in Shāhrastāni.² God, as it is therein said, had placed the spirit (the *frōhar* or *fravashi*) of Zoroaster in a tree (*Haoma?*), which He had caused to grow on the uppermost heaven, and which He afterwards transplanted to the summit of a mountain in Ādarbaijān, which is called Ismuvicār.³ There, it is also said, God had mixed the personality (here the *frōhar* is likely again meant) of Zoroaster with the milk of a cow, which the father of Zoroaster had drunk; out of this was afterwards formed the seed, and then a piece of flesh in the womb of Zoroaster's mother.⁴ Be that as it may, the legend affirms that the importance of her son was previously announced to the mother in a dream, a circumstance which we have often noticed in the Irānian traditions. When Dughda was in the fifth month of her pregnancy, she saw a terrible apparition in her dream. It appeared to her as if a thick cloud was raining on her house tigers, lions, wolves, dragons, serpents, and other noxious beasts, and amongst these wild animals one, that was larger and more frightful than the rest, appeared as if it were tearing the child out of her womb in order to kill it. While the mother gazes on this scene in great amazement, her child raises its voice to console her: demons of the above

¹ [This name is written somewhat differently in the *Dinkard*, bk. VII:—*Va ajash goft Pōrūshasp val Dugdūban*, "And so Porushasp said unto Dūkdūban." *Tr. n.*]

² Vol. I. 281 of Haarbrücker's Translation.

³ I consider the name Ismuvicār to be erroneously written for a more ancient Asnavandgar, and believe that the Savelan is here meant.

⁴ [Similar facts relating to Zoroaster's miraculous birth are also narrated in the *Dinkard*.]

description are unable to injure it. Indeed, its words have scarcely ended, when a mountain of light is seen descending from heaven, before which a large number of the creatures of darkness at once take to flight. As the light draws nearer, there issues out of it a handsome youth, who holds a staff in his left hand, and a manuscript in his right. At the sight of this manuscript the infernal beings still remaining withdraw with the exception of three—a wolf, a lion, and a panther : at last even they cannot hold their ground as soon as the youth inclines his rod towards them. When Dughda awakes, she hastens in confusion to a wise interpreter of dreams, who is, however, unable to expound at once her wonderful vision, and therefore tells her to return to him within three days. When she calls upon him again at the appointed time, he communicates to her that the child, with which she has been pregnant for 5 months and 23 days, will turn out a man of great consequence. The dark cloud and the mountain of light, which had appeared to her in the dream, signify that she and her son will have to endure at first much calamity from tyrants and similar wicked beings, but that they will overcome all dangers in the end. The staff which the youth held in his hand signified the Majesty of God, that turned against the oppressors. The manuscript in the other hand was the symbol of the prophetic dignity which would fall to the lot of her son. The three beasts that remained were the three most implacable enemies of Zoroaster, yet even they would finally have to give way.

The early life of the Irānian Prophet also consists of a series of wonders. When Zoroaster was born, a time at which other children are wont to cry, he laughed,¹ and by such extraordinary behaviour drew at once upon him the attention of the whole district. Such is the *first marvel* in his history. The demons, who naturally knew very well the object of Zoroaster's mission, and who, in order to thwart it, endeavoured to destroy the author of their fear, employed every means to annihilate him, and more than once opportunity seemed to favour them. The province, in which Zoroaster was born, belonged to a king Durānsarūn, of whom we know not whether he was identical with the Durāsrūn mentioned above in the table of Zoroaster's genealogy. This king was an unbeliever and the chief of all vicious magicians (*yūtu*), for every one then dealt in magic according to the statement of the *Zartusht-nāme*. The powers of darkness often carried on intercourse with men, and confirmed them in their wicked purposes ; even the father of Zoroaster did not hold himself entirely aloof from such dealings.² Now, when Durānsarūn heard of Zoroaster's birth and feared that the power of sorcery might come to an end if

¹ [Compare the *Dinkard*, bk. VII.

אֵבֶק אֶזְּ פֶּתָאק אִיגַחַשׁ (זַרְתֻּשְׁט) פַּוּוּן זַרְכְּחֻנַּשְׁנֶה בַּרְזִי קְחַנְדִּיל : "It is also

manifest (from the *good religion*) that he (Zoroaster) laughed at his birth."—*Tr. n.*]

² Especially according to the legend extant. But Dastur Peshotonji Behramji here justly remarks that the *Avesta* itself does not support that opinion.

the child grew up to strength, he speedily hastened towards the dwelling of Pōrushaspa, where he found the child lying in its cradle. Fiercely he drew his poniard to murder the child, but before he could inflict the fatal blow his hand was paralyzed, and he was compelled to withdraw without having effected his object. Such was the *second wonder*. The evil spirits, however, did not yet abandon their game so tamely; they long hoped that their evil designs might prevail in the end. They soon formed a design for stealing the child from his mother, and brought Zoroaster into the desert, where they piled up a heap of burning materials around him and set them on fire. Thus they confidently expected to annihilate him, but they were again deceived; the child slept calmly in the fire, and the mother hastening into the desert in search of her lost child found him again. This is the *third wonder*. Not long after this vain attempt, the sorcerers made a fresh effort. By the command of Durānsarūn they took the child and laid it on a narrow path, over which had to pass a herd of oxen under whose feet they hoped that it would be trampled to death; but, when the herd approached, the largest of the bulls took the child between his feet, and prevented any injury being done to it. This is the *fourth wonder*. The *fifth wonder* is really a mere repetition of the preceding. What the oxen had refused to do, was tried again with horses. The child was, therefore, again laid on a narrow path and a herd of wild horses driven over it, but this time a horse protected the child from the hoofs of the others. Next, as domestic animals could not be made to do any harm to Zoroaster, Durānsarūn strove to do so by means of wild beasts. He ordered a den of wolves to be discovered, and the young ones thereof to be slain during the absence of the old ones, and Zoroaster was laid in their place in the hope that the old wolves might in their first fury tear the child to pieces. These children of darkness did, indeed, show a great inclination to do so, but God closed their jaws, so that they could not hurt the child. On the contrary, there came two celestial cows which gave their udders to the child and suckled it. Such was the *sixth wonder* through which the life of Zoroaster was preserved.¹

After these fruitless endeavours all plans to destroy Zoroaster's life had to be given up as hopeless. The latter now gradually grew up in age, and his father found it necessary to have him educated. He selected as teacher a man who led a pious life in the midst of magicians and whose name was Barzīkarūs. When Zoroaster was seven years old, the sorcerers made a fresh attempt against him. They hoped that he would not be insensible at least to fears and terrors; and, therefore, they, by means of hellish witchcraft, brought fourth terrible apparitions, at which all were startled and took to flight, with the exception of Zoroaster, who remained perfectly calm in his firm confidence in the protecting power of God. Thus he also passed through this trial, which is usually reckoned as the *seventh wonder*. Not long after this

¹ Vide the *Dinkard*, bk. VII.

Zoroaster fell sick, and now the magicians hoped to destroy him. Instead of medicine they brought him some drink prepared from poisonous drugs ; but Zoroaster immediately detecting its dangerous nature rejected it, and was again preserved. This may be regarded as the *eighth wonder*. It may have been in the fifteenth year of Zoroaster's life, that his father gave a sumptuous banquet at his house to which King Durānsarūn and Burāntarūs, the most noted magician of the time, were also invited. Here Zoroaster took the opportunity of openly expressing his hatred of magic, and of proclaiming war against it. Henceforth the magicians trembled in his presence, and watched him attentively. His further deeds are, however, not handed down to us ; still it is self-evident that his life was entirely blameless. It is only said that the period of his trials lasted up to his thirtieth year, after which his piety began to bring forth fruit.

Of all the wonderful incidents which are recounted in the legend drawn from the history of Zoroaster's youth, we are able to quote only for one the evidence of earlier antiquity, namely, the circumstance that Zoroaster laughed at his birth, which is related already by Plinius and Solinus.¹ By this it is not naturally proved that all the rest of the wonders were also known to the ancients ; however, it is at least probable that such may have been the case with one or the other of them. The Avesta relates very little concerning the history of Zoroaster's youth. It is true M. Anquetil affirms that he has found in Ys. XLII. 8 an allusion to the hardships endured by the Prophet in his younger days ; but we believe that the passage referred to should be understood differently. So also with regard to the 19th chapter of the Vendidad, which could here be cited with much probability, but which we would rather appeal to for another and later exploit. The later narratives of Mahomedans show a partial knowledge of these events ; thus the writer Shāhrastāni, already quoted, who has related the previous wonders of the horses and the wolves, also asserts that Zoroaster cured a blind person in Dināver by means of a herb which he caused to be pressed upon the eyes of the patient. The laughing at the time of birth was likewise known to Shāhrastāni as well as to the historian Mirkhond : the latter also knew of the wonderful dream which had visited Zoroaster's mother.² Finally, a passage in a scholion to Plato's " Alcibiades," makes it very probable that the importance of the numbers seven, fifteen and

¹ Plinius, *Hist. nat.* VII. 16 : — "*Risisse eodem die, quo genitus esset, unum hominem accepimus Zoroastrem. Eidem cerebrum ita palpitasse ut impositam repelleret manum, futurae praesagio sapientiae.*" "Zoroaster is the only man of whom we have heard that he laughed on the very day of his birth. His brain also is said to have throbbled so violently that no hand could be laid upon his head — a presage of future wisdom." Similarly Solinus, c. 1. : "*Itaque unum novimus eadem hora risisse, qua erat natus, scilicet Zoroastrem mox optimarum artium peritissimum.*" "And so we know that one man laughed at the very hour in which he was born, namely, Zoroaster, afterwards most highly skilled in the best arts."

² For the passage referred to, *vide* Windischmann, *Zorast. Studien*, p. 275, note.

thirty in the history of Zoroaster's youth was recognized even in ancient times.

We now turn to the continuation of Zoroaster's biography after his thirtieth year, and to his real prophetic career. But here our legend appears to be somewhat incomplete. It is manifestly concerned only with the work of Zoroaster in Bactria, and is silent concerning his activity in other parts. At this point the Bundeshesh (79, 11), expressly tells us that Zoroaster promulgated his religion first of all in Aryana-vaija, and hence it becomes still more probable that, according to the view of the Avesta-followers, we should look in that country for the birth-place of Zoroaster; for, if he had been born in Urumia or even in some other region, we should have been told that the Prophet had travelled to Aryana-vaija. Of an immigration to Aryana-vaija the narrative knows nothing, while probably it speaks of an emigration from that country. The Bundeshesh further relates that the first man, who accepted the Law of Zoroaster, was his uncle Maidhyōmāo,¹ and this statement is also confirmed by the Avesta (Yt. XIII. 95). In other respects, however, we may presume that his doctrine did not find any great sympathy in Aryana-vaija, since he determined to emigrate with his true adherents. This removal is now described more in detail by the legend, according to which Zoroaster and his followers, after having travelled for some time, came to a sea which had to be crossed; but no vessel could be found anywhere, and Zoroaster thought it indecent that his companions, amongst whom there were also females, should undress themselves. A miracle helped to overcome this difficulty. As Zoroaster stretched forth his hands in prayer the water divided of itself, and the faithful marched through it dry-shod. MM. Anquetil and Ménant believe the sea here alluded to be the Araxes, and this is quite possible, assuming, as is indeed the case, that large rivers in the Irānian country are described as seas. We, however, prefer to understand thereby Lake Sevān, that is, in case this expedition of the legend should prove to be an old one, for which there is no particular evidence yet available. Even after the sea abovenamed was crossed Zoroaster and his followers did not yet find themselves within the limits of Irān; he still marched onward for the whole month of Spandārmāt, the last month of the year, and first reached the Irānian borders on the day of Anérān, the last day of the aforesaid month. There a festival was being celebrated at the very time, and Zoroaster was amongst the partakers in the feast. M. Anquetil believes this festival to have been that of Farvardyān; but that festival is an institution of Zoroaster, and we are unable to believe that it could have been already solemnized by the Irānians before they professed the *Mazdayasnān* religion. I believe, therefore, with M. Ménant, that the New-Year Festival is the one referred to.

¹ *Yo. paairyō. Zarathushtrāi. mūthremcha. gushth sāsniōscha*, "who first listened unto the Sacred Word and Teaching of Zarathushtra."

During the night after this feast Zoroaster had a dream full of the most auspicious intimations of his future success in Irān. It appeared to him as though he saw in the first a countless host moving towards him with hostile intent. It surrounded him on all sides, and did not leave him any room for escape. Then suddenly another army appeared coming from the South, which put the eastern one to flight. The interpretation of this dream is tolerably simple : the magicians and the followers of the Aḡrō Mainyu will take all pains to hinder the dissemination of Zoroaster's doctrine ; but the latter will triumphantly overcome all obstacles. Only, it is striking that the relieving army appears from the South, since the South is, according to the general notion of the Irānians, a region which pertains to the evil beings. Should this portion of the legend be ancient, the friendly army must have been regarded in the earlier ages as having come from the West. At the close of the festival Zoroaster continued his march, and came again to a large river, the Dāitya, on the day *Dai-pu-mihr* after the beginning of the year. This name does not in any case designate the Caspian Sea as M. Anquetil supposes, but the Araxes or Kur.¹ It must, therefore, be assumed that a part of the country on the left bank of that river was at an early period regarded as belonging to Irān, because Zoroaster found himself already within the limits of that country when he had reached the banks of the Dāitya. But, perhaps, the crossing of the Dāitya is wholly to be omitted in the passage in question, and this river is identical with that sea of whose miraculous crossing we have already heard.

Now, on the soil of Irān, begins the real prophetic career of Zoroaster, his communion with heaven, and the revelations imparted to him. There appears to him the Ameshaspend Vohu-manō who introduces him to Ahura Mazda, from Whom Zoroaster obtains permission to submit certain questions. The first question which is put by Zoroaster is : ‘ *Which of God's creatures is the best on earth ?* ’ Whereunto he receives the answer : ‘ *He is the best of all men who is pure of heart.* ’ Then he inquires about the names and duties of the angels, about the nature of Aḡrō Mainyu which evil spirit is then shown to him in hell, and is reported to have spoken on that occasion the words contained in Vd. XIX. 21.² Thereupon Zoroaster is favoured by God with various miraculous signs. He sees a fiery mountain and is commanded to pass through the fire. He does so and suffers not the slightest hurt thereby, not a hair of his head is singed. After this his body is opened and the entrails taken out ; these are then replaced in the body which is again closed and Zoroaster is alive as before [?]. At last melted ore is poured over his breast without his feeling any pain. Zoroaster forthwith learns the allegorical import of these acts. He is enjoined to explain to men that those who turn

¹ Vide Justi, *Beiträge* I, 12. 18. 2, 22 and *Eran. Alterthums*. bk. I. p. 200.

² “Do not slay my (wicked) creatures, O pure Zarathustra !”

towards Ahriman (Agrō Mainyu), must wander in a fire as large as the one through which he himself has passed, that just as his body was opened so also will streams of blood flow from their bodies. That melted ore was poured on Zoroaster's breast without his being injured by it is said to have been a prophecy respecting Āderbāt Māhrespand, on whom the same trial was inflicted without his thereby suffering any injury.

After this Zoroaster receives the Avesta from God, with His order to go to the court of king Vishtāspa (Gushtāsp), and to proclaim it there. When Zoroaster receives God's permission to depart, the different Ameshaspends approach him in order to communicate their respective counsels. These are the same commands and prohibitions as are also given in the *Rivāiets* and *Palets*. Vohu-manō commands him to bid mankind take great care of domestic animals and especially not to kill lambs without any need. Asha-vahishta recommends the tending of the fire and fire-altars. Khshathra-vairya orders the care of metals, lest they grow rusty. Spentā-ârmaiti forbids the pollution of the earth with blood and other impure substances, and recommends on the contrary its cultivation. Haurvatāt entrusts Zoroaster and his adherents with the care of water, Ameretāt with that of plants and trees.

No point in Zoroastrian legend can be better attested from ancient sources than the dialogues between Zoroaster and Ahura Mazda. One of the principal passages is Ys. XIII. 20, where mention is expressly made of their meetings; in other places it is only hinted that Ahura Mazda announced certain doctrines to Zoroaster which the latter proclaimed to the rest of men, (*vide* Vsp. II. 3, XIII. 2, Ys. LXX. 63). Properly speaking, the whole Avesta is a proof of this statement, for it is therein mentioned, in connection with any matter in any way important, how Zoroaster questioned Ahura Mazda upon it, and what precise answer he received in return. From the Gāthās I might here cite Ys. XLII., XLIII., where Zoroaster is represented in converse with Ahura Mazda.¹ According to the *Zartusht-nāme*, the conferences took place in Heaven—hence in the *Garōnmānu*—but M. Anquetil has already pointed to Vd. XXII. 53, as if their conversations had been held upon a mountain. The same is also reported by later writers and among others by Mirkhond,² who says that Zoroaster retired to a mountain in the vicinity of Ardebil, from which place he returned with the Avesta. This mountain seems to be the Savelon.³ Of the retreat of Zoroaster into solitude the ancients also had some knowledge to record; they ever admit his sojourn upon a mountain,⁴

¹ Dastur Peshotonji Bohramji refers to the passage Ys. XLII. 7, as treating of the conference of Zoroaster with Vohu-manō before his conversation with Ahura Mazda.

² *Vide* p. 286 in Shea's Translation.

³ *Vide* Lagarde, *Ges. Abhandlungen*, p. 171.

⁴ *Chrysost. Orat. Boryst.* p. 448. [A similar narrative is found besides in the Old Testament, Exodus, XIX. 3-18, where it is said that when "Moses went down from the mount (Sinai) unto the people . . . and it came to pass on the third day in the morning that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud, . . . and the mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire."]

which is said to have afterwards burst into flames, and whither the king of Persia approached with the most select portion of the Persian nobility; but Zoroaster came out of this fire unhurt, and gracefully conversed with those people, and enjoined them to be of good cheer, and to make certain offerings. Thenceforth he did not hold further communication with the people, but only with those who were most susceptible of truth and competent to deal with questions regarding the Deity. The statements of other ancient chroniclers are of similar import.¹ In them the legend of Zoroaster appears to be marred by a long *hiatus*; probably a multitude of deeds were related in earlier times, which Zoroaster was supposed to have accomplished in Media. The Zoroastrian legend, as we possess it, even in its oldest form, is founded on the appearance of Zoroaster in Balkh at the court of Gushtāsp, and passes over the former narratives as unimportant.

When Zoroaster, holding the Sacred Volume (*viz.* the Avesta) in his hand, returns from his consultation with Ahura Mazda, the evil spirits and the sorcerers hazard yet one last attempt against him in order to divert him, if possible, from the right path. Now he is too powerful to be defeated by them, nevertheless they beseech him to renounce the Avesta. Zoroaster listens to them with perfect contempt, and begins to recite the Avesta, whereupon the evil spirits are forced to fly and some of them are destroyed. This is, according to my view, the event alluded to in the 19th chapter of the Vendidad. According to the Zaratusht-nāme, Zoroaster received the order while in heaven to present himself at the court of Gushtāsp whither he now departs after defeating the demons and the magicians. This order to go to the court of Gushtāsp is also confirmed by the Avesta, as we may observe from Ys. XV. 14; but, according to Chaps. XLIV., XLV. of the same book, it appears as though Zoroaster had made an effort even at an earlier period in some other provinces of the Irānian empire. With the Avesta we must also believe that Zoroaster had formed his resolution in Aryana-vaija to go to the court of king Vishtāspa, for it is shown by Yt. V. 104, 105, that he had already offered sacrifices to Ardvī-sūra in the same district to induce the latter to assist him in his alliance with Vishtāspa. Elsewhere also Vishtāspa and his whole family are well known to the Avesta, as M. Windischmann² has sufficiently proved. However, it does not altogether follow, that the legend always regarded Gushtāsp as dwelling in Balkh. Hamza and Qazvini would rather place their meeting in Ātropātene.³ Khondemir affirms that Gush-

¹ Plin. Hist. N. XI. 42, 97. "*Trabant Zoroastrem in desertis casco vivere annis XXX, ita temperato ut estustatem non sentiret.*" "They say that Zoroaster lived thirty years in the desert on cheese so preserved as not to feel the effect of time."—Plutarch, *Quæst. Symp.* IV. 1. p. 660.

² *Zoroast. Studien*, p. 55.

³ Hamza, p. 36, ed. Gottw. اناء زردشت آذربيجان Qazvini II. 267 ed. Wüstenf.

tāsp dwelt in Istakhr. The ordinary belief, however, is that Zoroaster repaired to Balkh, and that there he was received in a solemn council by Gush-tāsp.¹ The wise men who were present at the king's court endeavoured to refute him. Thirty on his right hand and thirty on his left were all compelled to withdraw in confusion, and had to confess that a foreigner had conquered them in argument. This mental superiority disposed the king from the very beginning to favour the Prophet, and in consequence increased the envious desire of those who had previously shone in court through their wisdom still to uphold their former position. But Zoroaster also proved victorious in the second and the third day's discourse. Now when none of the sages could maintain their ground against Zoroaster, the latter made himself known as a prophet; the Avesta began to receive favour in the eyes of the king, and claimed acceptance. But the king, having listened to some portions of the Book, was not convinced as yet of the truth of its contents, and willing to consider the matter more maturely, he demanded that Zoroaster should remain at his court until further orders; and the latter was content with this preliminary success. However, even at this court his persecutions were not at an end. The wise men, once so highly esteemed, could not console themselves in their discomfiture, and endeavoured to raise suspicions against the Prophet in the mind of the king. They bribed the porter of his house and (during his absence) dragged therein unclean things; such as heads of dogs, cats, &c., whilst they also concealed some under his clothes. Then they alleged before their king that Zoroaster was nothing better than an impure sorcerer. The king was very angry, when, on more minute inquiry, these impure things were found in Zoroaster's dwelling, and he ordered him to be imprisoned. The time had now come for the Prophet to prove his divine mission by a miracle. The king had a black horse which he used to ride almost always, and which was also very dear to him. When, after these events, the keeper entered the stall, he observed with terror that the horse had lost his four feet, which had 'gone back into the body [?].' He informed the king at once of this occurrence, and the latter having convinced himself of the truth of the report, called in all the wise men; but they were unable either to advise or to help. In the meantime Zoroaster lies in his prison, and knows nothing of these events; but on this day of general distress the jailor forgets to bring him his dinner, which causes him in the evening to inquire what has taken place. As soon as he is made aware of the accident, he prevails upon the waiter to go the next morning before the king, and to announce to him that Zoroaster is ready to help under certain conditions. The king, who is helpless suffers Zoroaster to be called, and inquiries as to his conditions. The Prophet proposes four, so that on the fulfilment of each of them depends the re-appearance of one of the horse's

¹ That Zoroaster entered by the roof into the council hall of Gush-tāsp in a supernatural manner is not mentioned by the *Zartusht-nāme*, but probably by Qazvīni Comp. also Hyde, *Historia vet. Pers.* p. 320, 2nd ed.

fect. The first condition is that Gushtāsp shall firmly believe in the Prophet Zoroaster, and the divinity of his doctrine ; as soon as this is done the first foot of the horse re-appears. The second condition is that Isfandiār,¹ the son of Gushtāsp, shall devote himself entirely to the defence of the Zoroastrian faith ; as soon as Isfandiār has given the necessary assurances the second foot also shows itself. The third condition is that the wife of Gushtāsp shall also accept the Law ; this is at once proclaimed in the queen's chambers and she professes belief ;² whereupon the third foot of the horse makes its appearance. Lastly the fourth condition Zoroaster stipulates for on his own behalf the circumstances which led to his imprisonment are to be minutely inquired into. This inquiry proves favourable to Zoroaster, for the door-keeper now confesses having been suborned by the Prophet's enemies to introduce the unclean things found in Zoroaster's house. The Prophet is forgiven, while the instigators are punished. Now the fourth foot of the horse also re-appears, and Zoroaster attains to merited reverence.

The *Mazdayasnān* Law is now in such great honour with Gushtāsp, that the king does nothing without consulting the Prophet. The miracle of the horse is also narrated by Shāhrastāni. Mirkhond³ relates it quite in the same manner, though more briefly. One day Gushtāsp declares to his Prophet his intention of praying to God for four things : Firstly, that he may be shown the place which he will occupy in Paradise. Secondly, that his body may become invulnerable in war. Thirdly, that he may participate in the knowledge of all things which have already taken place or are yet to happen in the world. Fourthly and lastly, that his soul shall not be separated from his body until the resurrection. Zoroaster replies that those four requests may indeed be granted but not to one and the same person. that the king should therefore, choose which of the four requests he would desire for his own person ; the three remaining wishes might be distributed amongst three different individuals. Gushtāsp thereupon selects the first of the wishes for himself. There appear before him four existences of the spiritual world, *Ādar Khordād*, *Ādar Gushtasp*, and the two Ameshaspends, *Bahman* and *Ardibihisht*. They exhort the king not to fear ; but the latter is so terrified by the appearance

¹ The name Isfandiār is also not unknown to the Avesta, but it occurs there in its strictly altered form, *Spentodāta* (Yt. XIII. 103).

² In the Avesta also the wife of Vishtāspa appears as a patroness of Zoroaster. She is therein called *Hutaosa*, a name which might perhaps be compared with the Greek *Atossa*. In Yt. IX. we find Zarathushtra praying that she may co-operate with him in his meditation upon the Law. In Yt. XV. 53, she herself appears supplicating for the love of Vishtāspa. She must be identical with the *Katāyūn* of the *Shāh-nāma* ; but as the whole of the latter narrative is based on a weak foundation, it is not impossible that the author of the Avesta, as the earlier one, should ascribe to her another origin.

³ Shāhrastāni, vol. I. p. 283 of the German translation, speaks only of the fore-feet of the horse, which again became free when Zoroaster was released from prison. Mirkhond (in Shea, p. 287) narrates the wonder as above, only more briefly.

of the celestial beings, that he falls down from his throne, and cannot recover himself for a long time. Then Zoroaster performs the *Darūn-offering* with wine, fragrant flowers, milk, and pomegranates. He gives some of the wine to Gushtāsp to drink, who directly falls asleep and beholds in a dream Paradise and the place which is there destined for him. Peshotan receives the milk, and becomes thereby immortal. Jāmāsp receives the perfumes, and to his lot falls wisdom, which Gushtāsp had before desired for himself. Finally, Zoroaster gives some grains of the pomegranate to Isfandiār, and his body becomes thereby invulnerable. By these successive miracles the belief of Gushtāsp becomes more and more strengthened, and at this time the event narrated in Ys. IX. 46 is said to have happened, namely, the disappearance of the demons underground. At this time also Gushtāsp is said to have erected the first fire-temple. Inconsistent as these legends do appear at the first glance, there is every probability that they are in the main very ancient. We have previously had occasion to mention Peshotan as the spiritual guide of Isfandiār as son of Vishtāspa and as immortal he is also known to the Bundeshesh (p. 68). The Shāhnāme also informs us that Isfandiār became invulnerable through Zoroaster, though in a somewhat different manner, by means of a chain which he had received (Shāh-nāme 1134). Jāmāsp is also represented in the Avesta as very wise. In the *Jāmāsp-nāme*, which is certainly modern, he appears, quite as in the Avesta, in the possession of the knowledge of the past and of the future. The narrative of the erection of the fire-temple seems to follow the account given in the 17th chapter of the Bundeshesh. Even in the Book of Kings Dakiki also relates that Gushtāsp erected a temple to the Fire *Mêhr-burzin* or *Burzin-mêhr*,¹ and that this fire has since burnt without smoke. It is this fire which we know from the Bundeshesh to be the third of the holy fires, the fire of husbandmen; and it is said to have settled during Gushtāsp's reign on the mountain Rævañta in Khorāsān, after it had travelled throughout the world without any permanent resting-place. But, according to the same authority, the Fire *Frobâ*, the Fire of priests, which had its temple until then on a mountain in Khuârizm, is also said to have been brought thence into Kābulistān. Shāhrastāni² indeed differs here. He affirms that this Fire of Khuârizm was carried to Dārābgerd in Persepolis. The transference of this Fire of the priesthood from West to East may perhaps not have been universally believed in Irān, but can only stand in connection with the Bactrian conception of the Zoroastrian legend which we have before us. As Zoroaster emigrated from his native country and met with a hospitable reception from Gushtāsp, so also the Fire of the priests, who belonged to him and from whom they had emanated, must have travelled with him towards the East.

¹ Not to be confounded with the Fire *Burzin*, which was worshipped by Lohrasp.

² I. 299. On the other hand, Hamza says that Gushtāsp built a city in the district of Dārābgerd, which he named *رام وشتاسپان* (properly read *رام وشتاسپان*) may be the present city of Fāsā (Hamza, p. 37 ed. Gottw.).

The Zartusht-nāme, our principal source of information for the history of Zoroaster, does not relate his biography, but the history of Gushtāsp's conversion; it therefore breaks off at this point. We shall further on treat of the few chapters that still follow. Regarding the stories of miracles, which we have reported, we believe we have shown that they must be considerably ancient, at least in their main features. Yet we observe from the different statements of Mahomedan authors, that a number of other miracles of Zoroaster of which we know nothing at present, were recorded in earlier times. Thus Mirkhond¹ narrates that Zoroaster had a fire which he could hold in his hand without injuring himself, and that the Fire of the Magi (the above-named Ādar Frā) originated from it. The same historiographer further relates that Zoroaster suffered molten metal to be poured on his breast without being burnt thereby. More important than the above is the statement of Fīdūsi, that Gushtāsp planted a cypress-tree in Kishmir, which in the course of years grew to such an enormous height, that no lasso could reach it, and that over the tree he had caused a magnificent temple to be erected, calling upon all his subjects to go to the temple, and to offer their worship to the tree, which they accordingly did. Later accounts assert that when the Khalif Muttavakkel caused that miraculous tree to be felled, no less than 2,000 sheep and bullocks could find room underneath it, and that 300 camels were required for its removal². It is evident that this enormous tree cannot have been a cypress, for though there may have been large cypresses, still they cannot grow to the size which is supposed in that account. To this it may be added that it cannot be proved that the cypress is esteemed in the religion of Zoroaster as a sacred tree, though there are some traces which show that such may have been the case further to the West of Irān. However, all this is easily explained if we assume that Buddhism is here mistaken for Zoroastrianism. The Indian fig-tree, the *figus religiosa*, which sends new roots out of its branches into the earth, does indeed extend itself to a circumference as large as that described by the legend. This tree is regarded as sacred, especially by the Buddhists, for they believe that under its shadow the founder of their religion was invested with the dignity of Buddha. They have also the custom of sending sprigs of that holy tree to converted countries, and of erecting temples by their side.³ We have a detailed description of the transportation of the sacred tree to Ceylon, and we can as well assume that such twigs were also sent to Bactria after Buddhism had spread in that country. Where, too, we have to look for Kishmir and the so-called cypress, has already been said above. Far later than the legend above cited is another one respecting the contest of Zoroaster with the wise Chengrenghācha, an Indian Brāhmin, who went to Irān with the design of conquering Zoroaster; but as soon as he had listened to the

¹ Mirkhond, (ed. Shea) pp. 286 seq.

² Vuller's, *Fragmente über die Religion Zoroasters*, pp. 71, 113.

³ Comp. Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumsk.* I. 257.

Avesta, was turned from an enemy into a zealous adherent of the Prophet. This episode in the legend of Zoroaster was accepted in earlier times, because it was believed to be confirmed by the Avesta. However, this is erroneous, and M. Bréal has strikingly proved,¹ that Chengrenghācha was no other than Sankara-āchārya, who was renowned in India, and to whom a *Digvijaya*, i.e. a conquest of different territories was ascribed. Besides, this famous Brāhmin lived in the eighth century of our era; he could not, therefore, have met Zoroaster.

All that now remains for us to speak of concerns the personal circumstances of Zoroaster in the court at Balkh. M. Anquetil has collected the necessary material on this point, and later on M. Windischmann has so fully treated the subject, that I shall have to recall only what is already known. Besides the royal family, the frequently-named king Vishtāspa or Gushtāsp and his wife Hutaosa, Zoroaster also enjoyed friendly intercourse with the minister of the king, Jāmāspa, of the family of Hvôgva or Hvôva. We find him named in Ys. XIII. 24, XLV. 17, XLVIII. 9, L. 18, and Yt. V. 68 *seq.* In the last passage is described his victory over the demons. He stood on similar good terms with Frashaostra, the brother of Jāmāspa, (*vide* Ys. XIII. 24, XXVIII. 8, XLV. 16, XLVIII. 8, L. 17, LII. 2). . . . We learn from the Bundehesh (80, 1 *seq.*) that Zoroaster had three wives, one after another. By his first wife, whose name is not mentioned, he had a son Isatvāstra, and three daughters—Freni, Thriti, and Pouruchistā; by a second wife were born two other sons Hvarechithra and Urvatatnara. From these three sons the three orders of priests, warriors, and husbandmen are said to have originated.² All these names are also known to the Avesta. (*vide* Ys. XXIII. 4, XXVI. 17, Yt. XIII. 98, 139). The third wife of Zoroaster, being descended from the family of Hvôva, is generally named Hvôvi, (*vide* Yt. XIII. 139). Her children are not mentioned. In the Bundehesh (80, 7 *seq.*), it is said that Zoroaster thrice coupled with Hvôvi, thrice his seed fell over the earth, the *yazatu* Nairyosagha preserved it, and entrusted it to the protection of Anāhita, until the time shall have come when there shall spring therefrom the three future Saviours: Oshédar, Oshédar-māh, and Soshios. The mother of the last one is called in Yt. XIX. 92, Vispa-taurvi. These posthumous sons are also familiar to the Avesta, as clearly appears from Yt. XIII. 62, 128, 129.³

¹ *Vide Journal Asiatique*, 1862, p. 497.

² Though great pains have been taken to place the legend of Zoroaster in harmony with the heroic tradition, this passage, which entirely contradicts the earlier accounts given by us, appears to me to prove that the legend originally assumes a different genesis of the world than the Irānian heroic legend does, and consequently has no connection with the latter.

³ The *Vajarkard*, which is indeed apocryphal, (in p. 21, 22, ed. Bombay), agrees with the rest of the statements, with the remark that the mother of Isatvāstra and the three daughters was called Urvij, that the second wife was a widow, named Arnij Baredā whose first husband was called Matunabār (Mihryār).

¹ *Quodd Zoroastres precatus est, ut moriturus fulmine ictus interiret : et Persis denuntiavit, ubi me ignis caelestis consumserit, ossium meorum crematorum cineres servate, et quamdiu hoc facitis, regnum a vobis non aufertur : quod fecerunt. Ille autem, invocato Orione, a caelesti flamma depustus interiit.* "For Zoroaster prayed that when his hour approached, he might die by lightning ; and he said to the Persians : 'When the heavenly fire has consumed me, preserve the ashes of my (burned) bones, and as long as you do this, the kingdom shall not be taken away from you.' This they did. But he, calling upon Orion, was consumed by celestial fire and died." Thus also Suidas, though he makes Zoroaster an Assyrian.

[illegible]

That this prediction of the Prophet was, no doubt, verified is confirmed, amongst other evidences, by the testimony of the (Pahlavi) *Bahman Yasht*, ch. II. 3, the *Sād-dar*, ch. IX. 5 ("with Tūribrādarvakhsh who slew Zaratusht,") and the *Dūdastān-i-dīni*, ch. LXXII. 8, "One was Tūribrādarvakhsh, the *karap* and heterodox sorcerer, by whom the best of men was killed."—*Tr. n.*]

asserts that Zoroaster at least did not die in Balkh, but returned to Aryana-vaija after Gushtāsp's conversion.¹ The same book also raises the question why such a distinguished character, as Zoroaster was, should have died at all? We are informed that when Zoroaster asked immortality from God, the latter replied that if Zoroaster were to remain immortal, the wicked Turbarātūr would also remain immortal, the resurrection would then be impossible and mankind without hope. Then Ahura is said to have granted omniscience to Zoroaster for one moment,² when the latter beheld the delights of Paradise and the miseries of Hell, and was satisfied with the dispensations of Providence.

Now, after we have become acquainted with the circumstances of Zoroaster's life, as they are related, a question forces itself upon us, to which it is necessary, owing to the importance of the man, to find, if not a definite, at least a conditional answer. We mean the question whether Zoroaster was a mythical or a historical character. Nobody is likely to consider the accounts, which we have transcribed, as historical. We could obtain no clear knowledge concerning the interpretation of the name, nor the age nor even the native country of Zoroaster, and all this indeed least of all from Western narratives, though these are in point of time the more ancient ones. The Oriental reports are, it is true, more in harmony.... As the most solid nucleus might, perhaps remain the statements, that Zoroaster was descended from a royal race, that he had given proofs of his surpassing genius already in his fifteenth year, and

¹ The passage (to which Anquetil draws our attention) occurs in Sadder Bundeesh, fol. 140 :—

و اکون باید دانستن که آنگاه که زراثشت اسفندمان انوشم روان باد دین
در جهان روا کرد و شاه گشتاسب دین پذیرفت و در جهان روا و آشکاره کرد و
دیگر بهفت کشور زمین برسید و مردمان بردین استوار و بیگمان شدند و زراثشت
انوشیروان باد برخاست که به ایران ویج شود

² [Compare West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 194 : "In the Vohūman Yasht Commentary (*zand*) it is declared that Zaratūst asked immortality from Aūharmazd a second time, and spoke thus :—'I am Zaratūst, more righteous and more efficient among these thy creatures, O Creator ! when Thou shalt make me immortal as the tree opposed to harm, and Gōpatshāh, Gōshiti-Fryāu, and Chitrōkmyān, son of Vishtāsp, who is Pēshyōtanū, were made. When Thou shalt make me immortal, they in Thy good religion will believe that the upholder of religion, who receives from Aūharmazd this pure and good religion of the *Mazdayasnān*, will become immortal ; then those men will believe in Thy good religion.' Aūharmazd spoke thus :—'When I shall make thee immortal, O Zaratūst the Spitāmān ! then *Tūribrādarvakhsh* the Karap will become immortal, and when *Tūribrādarvakhsh* the Karap shall become immortal the resurrection and future existence are not possible.' Zaratūst seemed uneasy about it in his mind ; and Aūharmazd, through the wisdom of omniscience, knew what was thought by Zaratūst the Spitāmān with the righteous spirit, and He took hold of Zaratūst's hand. And He, Aūharmazd the Propitious Spirit, Creator of the material world, the Righteous One, even He put the omniscient wisdom, in the shape of water on the hand of Zaratūst, and said to him thus : 'Devour it.' And Zaratūst devoured it ; thereby the omniscient wisdom was intermingled with Zaratūst, and seven days and nights Zaratūst was in the Wisdom of Aūharmazd."—*Tr. n.*]

that with his thirtieth year he had commenced the promulgation of his religion in the different provinces of Irān, and especially in Arrān and Ādarabaijān, but above all at the court of Gushtāsp in Bactria. Such are the particular items derived from Eastern sources, with which those of Western origin also are not incompatible. Now the question is whether we are to regard all these events as mythical, so that no historical nucleus is to be found in all these narratives; or whether Zoroaster is a historical character, whose life was reduced to a bare tradition by means of legends. Both these views have found their advocates. The mythical view has been lately represented by M. Kern,¹ who, relying especially upon etymology, translates the name Zarathushtra, according to a supposition of M. Windischmann, into "a gold star," and who finds in the names Pourushaspa (many horses, *i.e.*, possessing beams of light) and Maidhyomāo (the middle-moon), a reference to the original sidereal power, and comes to the conclusion that Zoroaster was originally identical with Mithra, but did not signify the morning-star but the evening-star. At all events, the import of Zoroaster must have been utterly forgotten already at the time when the ancients wrote regarding him, and in the age when the Avesta was put together, because there the position of Zoroaster is evidently different. We can follow this view no more than Drs. Justi and Tiele, not because we are opposed in principle to a mythical conception of Zoroaster, but because we do not believe that sufficient proofs are at hand to confirm such a theory. Besides, in accordance with our entire comprehension of the Irānian epic, we would only be able to look upon a *mythus* of Zoroaster as the later-reflected myths, and not as the original ones. For, as we have shown, Zoroaster is indeed most appropriately inserted in the Irānian heroic legend, and even in a comparatively early period, though he does not belong to it originally. We find it, therefore, better, along with most inquiries, to compare Zoroaster rather with the Semitic prophets or with Sakyamuni, than with the Indian Rishis, and to consider the reports of his life as disfigured through their legendary form. But now the question will be asked: "What is legend, and what is truth?" We divest the accounts of Zoroaster of all mythical adjuncts; we believe that he was of royal blood; that in his thirtieth year he preached his doctrine in his native country; that the little approbation which they met with at the beginning induced him to emigrate to Bactria; and that he succeeded therein securing adherents by the help of a king Gushtāsp and we find that in all these statements there lies nothing which is not credible, but unfortunately we cannot also prove that they must have so happened. It is possible that Zoroaster proclaimed his religion in Bactria; but it is also possible that the Bactrian Magi merely asserted for some reason or another the

¹ Vide J. H. C. Kern: *Over het woord Zarathushtra en den mythischen Persoon van dien Naam* (Mededeelingen der K. Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde. Deel XI., 1867); and Tiele: *Is Zarathustra een mythisch Persoon*; and F. Justi in *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1867, nr. 51, and my own statement in *Heidelb. Fahrbücher*, 1867, nr. 43.

ancient connection of Zoroaster with that city, just in the same manner that the Buddhists cause their Sakyamuni to appear in Ceylon, etc., where he never set foot. In general, if we compare the above-mentioned plain circumstances of Zoroaster's life with those of other like characters, we are inclined to doubt even the latter. Especially in the history of Sakyamuni does there appear to me to exist some similarity. Zoroaster has in common with him royal birth, remarkable supernatural talents displayed in his youth, and lastly the circumstance that he enters upon his vocation of teacher in his thirtieth year. On the other hand, the assumption of his prophetic dignity, and his immediate intercourse with the Deity remind one of Moses and the Semitic laws, that is, in the form in which the narrative has been transmitted to us in Chrysostom. Nay more, some analogy has even been discovered between the 19th chapter of the Vendidād and the history of the temptation by Mathew ; even here a Buddhist parallel may also be found, namely, in the temptations to which Sakyamuni was exposed by Mara, and here Buddhism, indeed, seems to be the borrowing party. We can here, of course, merely allude to such points of contact, but in our opinion they would well deserve a closer study. After all this, the only thing certain that we can extract from the whole of Zoroaster's biography, is that he really did live. The proof for this assumption lies in the internal evidence, which will be fully discussed later on, that is, in the strict and thoroughly well-considered method which is displayed throughout the whole religion, and which necessarily shows that a single individual at least put his finishing hand to it, whatever may have been his name.

That Zoroaster left behind him some manuscripts is the opinion generally held by the ancients. The opinion of Hermippus on the writings of Zoroaster is well known, and proves the existence of such writings, as are ascribed to him, in the third century before Christ.¹ Even Western authors admit that Zoroaster left behind him his revelations in writing, the original text indeed being named according to Masudi (T. H. 126 ed. P.) Bestā (Avesta) and that, as an aid to its right understanding, he afterwards wrote a commentary under the name Zend, and later on a second commentary under the name Pāzend. After Zoroaster's death the theologians of the Zoroastrian religion wrote a fresh explanation of the earlier commentaries under the name Barida. It is not our purpose to enter here into this subject, which must be more fully discussed further on ; only we shall here remark that the Book of Kings also is familiar with this Avesta and Zend and often mentions them. But, though the Book of Kings distinctly teaches us that Zoroaster first taught the Avesta and Zend during the reign of Gushtāsp, and that consequently these books could not have been in existence before, still it commits the inconsistency of supposing their existence in an earlier period. Kaikhosrao especially is very often represented as reciting the Avesta and Zend (Shāh-nāme, p. 964, ll.

¹ Comp. Windischmann, *Zoroast. Studien*, pp. 288 seq.

11 *seq.*; (Vul. ed. p. 981 ; p. 985, ll. 3 *seq.*) According to one passage (p. 910, l. 5), even Frēdūn deposited in Baikend the Avesta written in golden characters. Such inaccuracies seem to me to prove that the artificial arrangements, according to which Zoroaster is placed at the close of the mythical period, had not yet entirely come into vogue.

Now, after we have made the necessary remarks upon the personality of Zoroaster, we may turn to the reign of Gushtāsp, and consequently to the promulgation of the Prophet's religion. Lohrāsp, having entrusted the kingdom to his son before his own death, retired to a fire-temple at Balkh. According to Fīrdūsi a religious war follows very close upon Gushtāsp's embracing Zoroastrian Law. The demons are anxious that the intelligence of the great revolution, which has taken place in Irān, should soon reach the ears of Arjāsp, king of Tūrān. The latter at once determines not to tolerate the innovation. He sends an embassy with a letter to Gushtāsp, wherein he admonishes the latter not to listen to the allurements of Zoroaster but to return to the path of justice. Should Gushtāsp comply with his demands he promises to give him rich presents ; but should he not take his admonition to heart, he threatens to come with an army in a few months and to desolate Irān. Gushtāsp communicates the message received to his confidential friends, Zarir, Isfandiār, and Jāmāsp, and these undertake to give the proper reply to the king of Tūrān, in which they particularly warn him not to approach Irān with an army, as they themselves intend to march with their forces towards his country. Then preparations are made on both sides and the hostile armies meet near the Oxus. This battle, however, differs materially from earlier ones in the fact that Gushtāsp knew its result beforehand ; for he had on his side Jāmāsp, the Wise, who, as we already know, was cognizant of the past as well as of the future, and who then told Gushtāsp that the battle, though it would turn out a very bloody one, would surely end in his favour. What Jāmāsp had foretold naturally happened. In the single combats which took place, Ardashir, Sheru, and Shedasp, the three sons of Gushtāsp, fell. Then Kerāmi, the son of Jāmāsp, forced his way into the fight. The imperial banner, which the Irānians had abandoned in the general tumult, was recaptured by Kerāmi, and when the Tūrānians cut off one of his arms he held the banner firmly between his teeth, while he fought with the other arm. But at last he also fell under the blows of overwhelming numbers. Several others among the most valiant Irānians also perished ; but in the end Zarir, the commander-in-chief and brother of the king, came on the scene and caused great destruction amongst the Tūrānian heroes. Thus affairs went on for two weeks, and Arjāsp promised a handsome reward to whosoever amongst his heroes would vanquish Zarir ; but nobody dared undertake the task. At last Biderefsh undertook it. But even he did not venture to meet Zarir in open combat, and shot him dead with an arrow fired from an ambuscade.

The death of Zarir produced great terror in the hearts of the Irānians, and king Gushtāsp, having failed in animating his heroes to avenge the death of Zarir, made a vow that in case he should succeed in his battle with Arjāsp, he would resign his crown to Isfandiār and his army to Peshotan, whilst he himself would retire into solitude after the example of his father Lohrāsp. This vow was naturally a stimulus to Isfandiār to distinguish himself. He threw himself into the thickest of the fight, slew Biderefish and brought back the arms and the horse of Zarir to the Irānian camp. In a short time no man dared risk a combat with him. Arjāsp finally gave up the battle as lost and fled. The deserted army offered to accept the true Faith and was pardoned by Gushtāsp.

This battle between Gushtāsp and Arjāsp, which we have just narrated, is in its principal features also current in the Avesta. There, too, we find Vishtāspa frequently praying that he may conquer Arejat-aspa, (Yt. V. 109; IX. 30; XVII. 50; XIX. 87). Arejat-aspa himself also once (Yt. V. 116) appears praying that he may be granted a triumph over Gushtāsp.

Gushtāsp then commissioned Nestūr, the son of Zarir, who had fallen in battle, to invade the kingdom of Arjāsp and to press further his victory, while he himself returned to his country and sent his son Isfandiār all over the world to propagate the Zoroastrian Law. The latter nowhere met with opposition. The Kaiser of Rūm and all princes showed themselves willing to embrace the new religion and requested him to forward the religious books. *Isfandiār was then soon able to inform his father, that the faith of Zoroaster had been accepted throughout the world.* Gushtāsp, however, did not appear to remember a word of his former vow to cede his throne voluntarily to Isfandiār after his successful return. On the contrary, circumstances assumed quite a different aspect, and showed the pious Gushtāsp in altogether a peculiar light. Kerzem, a kinsman of the royal house, who hated Isfandiār, calumniated the latter to his father, affirming that he had collected an army to dethrone Gushtāsp. The king readily believed the calumniator and despatched Jāmāsp with a letter ordering Isfandiār to return forthwith to the court. Jāmāsp, as well as Isfandiār himself, knew that evil days awaited the prince if he should answer the summons. Nevertheless, both were of opinion that the commands of his father must be obeyed. They regarded the whole affair as manifestly a trial which had come over the Hero of the Faith, and which the latter had to meet with courage. Gushtāsp, indeed, caused heavy fetters to be laid on Isfandiār on the ground of high treason, and ordered him to be carried to the stronghold of Kenbedan,¹ there to be bound fast to four iron stakes. How foolish such a proceeding was, Gushtāsp was soon to learn. Some time after this event the king went to Zābul in order to pay a visit to

¹ According to the author of Mujmil the fortress of Kenbedan is identical with Girdkōh, which is supposed to lie in Māzenderān. Indeed, Melgunof (*das nördliche Ufer*, etc., p. 134), mentions a mountain-peak Girdkōh, which lies in the vicinity of the road leading from Asterābād to Shāhrūd.

Rustem. The visit lasted very long, fully two years. Meanwhile the news of Isfandiār's imprisonment spread abroad, and the king, who had no need of being afraid any longer of that hero, almost abandoned Zoroaster's religion. Arjāsp also heard this intelligence with delight, as it offered him some prospect of vengeance, for the army, which Isfandiār had placed under the command of his son Behman, had in part disbanded itself, and in part marched to the vicinity of Kenbedan, in order not to be far distant from its beloved commander. As soon as Arjāsp received certain information of these events, and particularly of there being no troops in Balkh,¹ he levied an army, and gave his son Kehrem orders to advance against that city, he himself following soon after with a second army. The project succeeded, and Balkh was taken by surprise, no garrison being found there excepting Lohrāsp and other pious men who adored the sacred fire in retirement. It is true that Lohrāsp immediately took up arms and placed himself at the head of the effective burghers; but, though he sold his life dearly, he was unable to prevent the taking of the town. After his death the fire-temple was invaded and the remaining pious priests slain. With their blood the sacred fire was extinguished, and both the daughters of Gushtāsp, Humāi and Behāfrid, were taken into captivity. Still it was fortunate that it occurred to one of the wives of Gushtāsp to steal away from the town in Turkish costume, and to go to Sajistān in order to communicate the important intelligence to Gushtāsp. The latter, thereupon, speedily levied an army; but no sooner had he approached Balkh than Arjāsp came with a second force to the assistance of Kehrem. It is remarkable enough that Rustem should have let his guest depart, when his position was so desperate, without rendering him any assistance. The battle between Gushtāsp and Arjāsp was a very fierce one, in which many heroes fell on both sides. Thirty-eight sons² of Gushtāsp, who took part in the struggle, all perished. Gushtāsp, losing hope, took to flight and was closely pursued by the Tūrānians, who attempted to capture him. Fortunately the flying Irānians came to a steep declivity, the approach to which was only known to Gushtāsp, who led thither his army in safety.³ Now the Tūrānians who pursued him, could not find any way up the mountain and were forced to remain content

¹ Here end the portions of the Book of Kings composed by Dakīkī.

² The names of these sons seem to be partly mentioned in Yt. XIII. 101. [*Zairi-vairi*, *Yukhta-vairi*, *Sriraokhsan*, *Keresaoxshan*, *Vanāra*, *Varāza*, *Būjisaravah*, *Berezyarshiti*, *Tizyarshti*, *Perethuarshti* and *Vizyarshti*. These names, I suppose, belong to the brothers of Gushtāsp rather than to his sons. *Zairi-vairi* is identical with the Persian Zarir, the son of Lohrūsp (*Aurvāt-aspa*). Vide Yt. V. 112. Among other names West believes *Būjisaravah* to be possibly the same with *Pāt-Khosrav*, a brother to Vishtāspa in the *Yad-kāri Zarirān*. (Comp. Darmesteter, Yt. XIII. p. 205, n. 5.) *Tr. n.*]

³ I have no doubt that this mountain is the same with that mentioned by the Bunde-hesh, and named *Maṭ-ṣ-friyād* ("it came to help"). According to the view of the Bunde-hesh this mountain appears to have been severed from the extensive range to which it belonged at the time of Gushtāsp's flight, and to have offered a refuge to that religious

with blockading the Irānian army on all sides. In this embarrassed position Gushtāsp was now completely helpless, and turning to Jāmāsp, asked him whether he could find any means of escape. Jāmāsp replied that nobody except Isfandiār was able to deliver him from danger. So Gushtāsp determined to address himself to his heroic son, whom he had so deeply offended, and Jāmāsp was again the bearer of his message. Again did Gushtāsp declare his resolution to renounce the throne and to retire into solitude, in case he were rescued from his present danger, and offer to make Isfandiār his successor. Should the latter refuse, the empire of Irān was undone. Jāmāsp dressed as a Tūrānian stole through the ranks of the enemy and succeeded in reaching Kenbedan, where he communicated to Isfandiār the proposals of Gushtāsp, but found Isfandiār very little disposed to consent. At last, however, the persuasions of Jāmāsp induced him to forget his personal grievances, and to render the desired help to his father. Isfandiār then forced his way through the hostile army, killed many Tūrānians and revived the courage of the Irānians; whilst Arjāsp on the contrary became despondent, for he had trusted that he would be able to bring the war to an end without the interference of Isfandiār. And, indeed, in the ensuing battle Isfandiār achieved great feats of heroism; he captured Kergesvar alive who alone ventured to fight with him. Besides, he killed so many Tūrānians, that Arjāsp once again abandoned his army intent only upon safely regaining Tūrān.

king. [West reads Madōfryād ("come-to-help"), and renders the passage in which this name occurs as follows:—"From the same Padashkhvārgar mountain unto Mount Kūmis, which they call Mount Madōfryād—that in which Vishtāspa routed Arjāsp—is Mount Miyānidasht ('mid-plain'), and was broken off from that mountain there." Vide 'Pahlavi Texts,' *Bundehesh*, chapter XII. 32.]

IRANIAN ART.*

WHETHER it be entirely due to accidental circumstances or not, it is at least a remarkable fact that all the monuments of Irānian art now in existence belong exclusively to the two Southern dynasties. The cuneiform inscriptions, which have been found in Media, are either foreign to that country, or at least do not belong to the Irānian dynasty of Media. Herodotus relates (I. 98, 99) that Deioces compelled the Medes to build him a fortress. Nevertheless, in the assertion that the seven battlements of this fortress were painted in seven different colours, we may trace the influence of Babylon, where we also find structures having seven storeys, each storey built with bricks of different colours, each colour representing a different planet.¹ Polybius, too (10, 27), mentions a splendid palace in Ekbatana; yet we do not know whether its erection can be ascribed to such a remote period. No traces of the fortress of Deioces, or even of a later palace, can now be found on the site of the ancient Ekbatana. But, though the disappearance of those monuments may be explained by the great antiquity of the Median empire, the same apology cannot be urged in favour of the empire of the Arsacidae. Moreover, it is evident that the kings of that dynasty had no ambition to hand down their glory to posterity, either by the raising of monumental buildings or by engraving inscriptions.

The artistic monuments belonging to the Achaemenidae date from the very founder of their dynasty, Cyrus, the remains of whose edifices lie in the plains of Murghāb.² We cannot believe the assumption that the plains of Murghāb were identical with the ancient Pasargadæ;³ however, this fact

* Translated from the German of Dr. F. Von Spiegel, *Iranische Alterthumskunde*, Vol III., bk. VII, Chap. V. pp. 797-834.

¹ Cf. Lenormant, *Manuel de l'histoire ancienne de l'Orient*, II. p. 345. Duncker in the latest edition of his *Geschichte des Alterthums* questions this opinion, which, though it cannot be completely proved, is at least highly probable. [Compare also *La Magie chez les Chaldeens*, "Chaldean Magic," Eng. ed. pp. 226-227 :—"The worship of the stars was fully developed in the system of Median Magic. . . . Evidently it came into Persia from the Magi. The principal feature of this worship amongst the Medes is made known to us by the description which Herodotus gives of the seven walls of Ekbatana, each with the sacred colour of one of the seven planets. The same sacramental arrangement was observed in the town of Ganzakh, the Ganzaca of the classical writers, and in Ātrōpātēne, since Moses Chorenensis calls it 'the second Ekbatana, the town with seven walls.' Later, in the period of the Sassanian dynasty, the Persian poet Nizāmi describes this style as prevailing in the 'Palace of the Seven Planets' built by Behrām-Gour or Verahrān V. (A.D. 420)."] The famous Babylonian tower of Borsippa is said to have had seven storeys with the colours representing the seven planetary bodies.—*Tr. n.*

² [Vide Spiegel, *Iranische Alterthumskunde*, vol. I. p. 95. An extensive valley near the upper banks of the Pulvār is called the Murghāb valley.]

³ [Vide Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 487 :—"The hill unquestionably commands the entrance to the valley, or rather plain of Murghāb, now admitted to be that of Pasargadæ; but the strong natural barriers, which the mountains present to the south and to the north, render additional walls unnecessary. Nevertheless, Pliny (VI. 26) calls this spot the Castle of Pasargadæ, occupied by the Magi, and wherein is the tomb of Cyrus :—" *Inde ad orientem*

does not imply that Cyrus could never have built in that region. Several edifices, indeed, seem to have once existed there ; ¹ but they have been so utterly demolished, that no plan of them can now be made out. A platform is still visible, leaning towards the hill which commands the plains of Murghāb. It is 264 feet high and has a frontage of more than 200 feet ; but the buildings, which formerly stood on this platform, have long since disappeared. In another part of the plain there is a second platform, on which five pillars, the remains of a smaller palace, are still erect. On one of these pillars there is the image of a man wearing a peculiar head-dress, such as is observed also on Egyptian monuments, and with wings apparently issuing from the shoulders. A short inscription over the image states that it represents *Kurus*, the king of the Achaemenidae. Certain peculiarities in the inscription seem to prove that it is older than the other cuneiform writings, and that it may even date from Cyrus² the Great. This supposition is borne out by the wings, which, as we already know, are symbols of kingly majesty.³ The head-dress is supposed to represent splendour and glory. But, since Cyrus in his inscription calls himself simply " king," it seems that that image must have been carved even before he had assumed the title of " Great King." A third edifice, which is in a state of complete preservation and belongs to the time of the Achaemenidae, is now popularly known as the sepulchre of the mother of Suliemān. It is really a tomb, though not that of Cyrus, but probably of a

Magi oblinent Pasargardas castellum, in quo Cyri sepulcrum est." The city of Pasargadæ may, therefore, rather be considered a holy city, consecrated to the Colleges of the Magi, and the officers of religion, than as a stationary royal residence. And nothing can be more probable, since it was built by Cyrus to commemorate the great victories which made him king, than that he should consecrate it to the gods. Cyrus, according to Xenophon, made seven visits into Persia Proper, his original kingdom, after his accession to the vast empire to which he gave its name ; and although that historian does not specify the particular place in his paternal land, whither he went to perform his accustomed religious duties ; yet, as he was the founder of Pasargadæ, avowedly as a memorial of his national achievements, what can we more naturally suppose, than that Pasargadæ would be the scene of such rites ?"—*Tr. n.*]

¹ Comp. Ker Porter, "Travels," (London, 1821), vol. I. pp. 485 *seq.* Ménant, *Les Achéménides*, p. 17.

² Cf. Spiegel, *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften*, pp. 75, 145.

³ [Comp. *ibid.*, vol. III. p. 590 :—"Herodotus relates that when Cyrus had a mind to attack the Massagetae, he fancied in his dream that he saw two wings growing from the shoulders of Darius, and that one of these over-shadowed Asia, the other Europe ; this may only be a symbol of royal dignity, and in fact we find in Murghāb, Cyrus himself represented with wings and with a head-dress which can only be supposed to be a halo emblematic of royalty. This is found only in the case of members of the royal family, who are distinguished also by other symbols from the generality of mankind. For instance, the descendants of Kaiqobād have black moles on their arms, and the Seleucids spread the belief that they were born with a mark on their hips in the shape of a buoy."—*Tr. n.*]

woman.¹ A wide area surrounds this tomb,² which may be recognized from its outward appearance by the remains of 24 round columns forming a quadrangle having six columns on each face.³ The base, on which the sepulchre rests, is composed of huge blocks of beautiful white marble, rising in a series of steps. At the foot of these steps the base measures 40 feet in one direction and 44 in the other. The lowest step is 5 feet 6 inches high, the second begins 2 feet from the edge of the first, and measures 3 feet and 6 inches in height. the third is 3 feet 4 inches high, the fourth 1 foot 11 inches, the fifth 1 foot 10 inches, and the sixth is of the same height as the fifth. On the top rises the sepulchre, which opens on the north-western side, and is 4 feet in height. Its interior contains only one empty chamber. It is probable that this edifice is modelled after the Babylonian temples, though on a reduced scale and executed in stone.⁴ According to Sir Henry Rawlinson's assertion, the work of excavation in the plains of Murghāb ought to prove useful, and we may expect from it interesting results in the future.

From Murghāb a march of only a few leagues brings us to the magnificent valley, in which was the old residence of the Achaemenidae. The plain is called Hafrek, or more commonly, though erroneously, Merdasht, which only denotes the tract extending from the ruins of Istakhr, on the left bank of the Palvār, to the junction of this river with the Kum Firūz. We know from ancient chronicles how the royal palace of Persia was destroyed by a Greek courtesan, who in the course of a drunken orgy threw a burning torch into the edifice. Nevertheless, some portions of it have been preserved to this day. The plain of Hafrek also contains a few more ruins of the same age. The present population of Irān, having long since lost all remembrance of the Achaemenidae, give to these ruins entirely false names, and generally associate them with the heroes of old legendary history. The most important are known by the name of the Forty Columns (*Chihil-setūn* or *Chihil-minār*).⁵

¹ [*Cf. E. A.* vol. II. p. 621. Oppert believes that the modern Murghāb may be identical with the *Map'p'āstūr* mentioned by Ptolemy, (VI. 4); nevertheless he supposes that the sepulchre may be that of a woman, possibly of Kassandane referred to by Herodotus in II. 1.]

² Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 499.

³ [To have six columns on each side, four must be placed within the quadrangle. —*Tr. n.*]

⁴ Ferguson, "History of Architecture," vol. I. p. 156.

⁵ ["These ruins, for which the name *Chihil Menāre* or the 'forty minarets,' can be traced back to the 13th century, are now known as Takhti Jamshid, 'the throne of Jamshid.' That they represent the Persepolis captured and partly destroyed by Alexander the Great, has been beyond dispute at least since the time of Pietro della Valle. Amongst the earlier scholars the fanciful notions of the Persians, who are utterly ignorant of the real history of their country before Alexander, often received too much attention; hence many of them were of opinion that the buildings were of much higher antiquity than the

A description of the palace, as it existed before its destruction, has been transmitted to us by Diodorus, (17, 71).¹ According to his statement, the castle had three walls, of which the first was 16 ells high and provided with a parapet; the second wall had double this height; the third, which formed a quadrangle 60 ells in height, was built of immense blocks of stone; on each side were brazen doors and also railings 20 ells high. The interior of the castle contained chambers for the king and his chief officers, and the treasury. This account seems to be quite borne out by the remains of the castle existing at the present day. The first two walls mentioned by Diodorus have disappeared; but the inner quadrangle containing the castle proper still remains. This castle stood on a cliff, the sides of which had been made perpendicular by art, partly by scarping the black marble rock, and partly by erecting a massive wall against its sides. The terrace thus formed had its front towards the west, the right side towards the north, the left towards the south, while the back or the eastern side was connected with the higher mountain behind. The height of this terrace is about 11 yards, its length from north to south about 520 yards, and its breadth from east to west 315 yards.² Its shape may be described as almost quadrangular, though with many corners or angles and small projections. The surface is not quite level, but divides itself into three platforms of different heights. The ascent is on the western side, though not in the middle, but nearer the north. A splendid double flight of stairs leads up to the terrace. It is about 23 feet broad, and formed of blocks of marble so immense that ten steps and about a seventh part of the eleventh are cut in a single block, while each of these steps is scarcely 4 inches high, so that one can easily ride up on horseback. Each of the two staircases has a resting-place in the middle. On the southern side, also, a smaller and steeper staircase leads up to the platform, and probably a similar one, as I conjecture, existed on the northern side. As soon as you ascend the platform, you stand before two pillars from which stand out two gigantic bulls (about 18 feet high and 19½ feet long). They stand on pedestals of about 5 feet in height and form the remains of a doorway only 12½ feet in breadth. This doorway leads into a small apartment, which had, even in M. Chardin's

time of Cyrus; and even those who rightly regarded them as the works of the Achaemenians, were unable to support their theory by conclusive evidence. The decipherment of the cuneiform Persian inscriptions found on the ruins and in the neighbourhood has put an end to all doubt on this point. We now read with absolute certainty that some of the edifices are the work of Darius I., Xerxes, Artaxerxes III. (Ochus), and with equal certainty we may conclude that all the others were built under the Achaemenian dynasty." *Vide* "Encyclopædia Britannica."—*Tr. n.*]

¹ Besides the works of Niebuhr and Ker Porter, for this description I have also referred to Lassen's article on Persepolis in *Der Ersch und Gruberschen Encyclopädie*, Menant's *Les Achéménides*, (Paris 1872), and Fergusson's "History of Architecture."

² Comp. Menant, *Les Achéménides*, p. 39. According to Ker Porter (I. p. 582), the terrace has a length of 802 feet towards the south, 926 feet towards the north, and 1,425 feet towards the west.

time, four splendid columns. At present only two are erect ($54\frac{1}{10}$ feet high). They are evidently relics of a portico, which led to two other pillars with corresponding figures. In the latter the bulls are represented with human faces wearing tiaras. We now learn that the figures of these fabulous beasts are imitations of the Assyrian style of architecture.¹ An inscription at the entry (D, as it is generally named), informs us that this door was built by Xerxes and intended to be the ordinary entrance. This accounts for the large double staircase, which served for the accommodation of deputations consisting of great numbers of people. The only trace yet existing on the smooth-worn part of the terrace, besides this entrance, is a conspicuous cistern, probably a relic of an ancient aqueduct. This part of the structure may also have contained the quarters of the guards and other servants of the castle. If you turn from this doorway to the right hand (*i.e.*, to the south), you come to a second splendid staircase, through which you ascend, by 31 steps, to the second part of the terrace, which is higher by $6\frac{1}{2}$ feet. There are altogether four staircases; a double staircase in the middle, and single staircases rising on the eastern and western sides. The projecting wall of the middle staircase is covered with sculptures divided by three tablets intended for inscriptions.² Two of these tablets are blank, and the Old Persian text (A) alone has been engraved on the third. It dates from Xerxes I. On both sides of the inscriptions stand figures, three on the right with spears and shields, four on the left with spears only. The number seven I do not consider to be merely accidental. Each of the figures wears a high tiara and the Median costume, while the beard and hair are carefully curled. Probably they represent bodyguards and chamberlains, who watched the entrance to the royal apartments. The two angular spaces on each side of these figures are filled with effigies of a lion attacking a fabulous beast. The rear wall also of that part of the platform, from which the staircase projects, extends from east to west, side by side with the ascending steps, and is covered with engraved figures of persons apparently ascending. Originally there were three rows of such figures, but the topmost row has been half destroyed, which circumstance proves that the wall must have been formerly higher. The length of each row is 68 feet. Towards the east the lowest row includes 53 persons standing,³ of whom 32 are men, partly in close-fitting and partly in wide garments. The latter seems to be the Persian, the former the Median costume. The head is apparently covered by a flat cap; hair and beard are dressed with the customary care. Some of the figures carry bows, others short swords; others again

¹ Cf. Ménant, *ibid*, p. 40. He surmises that the faces of these beasts were likenesses, and that it is not difficult to recognize in their features the monarchs whom the artist intended to represent.

² Cf. Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 594 and tablet 34.

³ Niebuhr, tablet 21. Ker Porter, tablet 37.

are without any weapons, but adorned with necklaces, ear-rings, and bracelets, all royal insignia, perhaps indicative of their rank. Several of them carry a staff with a ball. These are, as Sir R. Ker Porter correctly supposes, the so-called *Melophores*. Before these 32 figures march 21 armed men, probably a portion of the body-guard. The second row shows again 32 persons of the same description, preceded by 21 spearmen. The figures in the third row cannot now be made out. I am inclined to believe that these personages are partly the great men of the Empire, who had the special privilege of ascending in the presence of the king by the chief staircase. Still more interesting are the carvings on the western side of the wall.¹ Here also there are three rows, one above the other. The highest row is again damaged. The figures are arranged in divisions of six persons each, the divisions being separated from one another by a border of cypress leaves. The first figure in each wears a wide, flowing robe, a tiara, dagger, and girdle, and bears a long staff. M. Lassen is perfectly right in surmising these to be the so-called *σκηπτοῦχι* of Xenophon, (*Cyropædia*, 8, 3, 15 and 22), royal chamberlains, who had to conduct the deputations into the presence of the king. Their distinctive attire seems to indicate their rank. As to the persons ushered in by them, every division has its peculiar costume.² The second figure in each wears no clothing, but the others are distinguished by divers articles of dress which they wear or carry, or by their cattle, horses, and chariots. Spearmen do not seem to march before them, but they are carved above the steps of the staircase, one over each step. It has long been the unanimous opinion of antiquarians that these persons represent delegates who bring tribute from the provinces. Whether this was on some peculiar occasion, such as New Year's Day, the birthday of the king, or the like, cannot be ascertained. On the eastern and western extremities of this wall is also represented the lion attacking a fabulous beast.

After mounting upstairs, you come to a perron in a great portico, which is the chief attraction of the ruins of Persepolis and has given rise to the name of *Chihil-minār* or "Forty Columns." The centre of this portico was formed by a quadrangle of 36 columns, in 6 rows; three other groups of twelve columns, each in two rows, stand on the north, east, and west sides of this quadrangle, forming a vestibule and two side wings to the great hall. On the south side there is no such group. So there were, on the whole, 72 columns, the positions of which may still be recognized, but of which only thirteen are now erect. The columns are all of black marble, each having 32 flutes or channels. The height of each is 64 feet, that of the capital being 46 feet. The bases of

¹ Niebuhr, tablet 22. Ker Porter, tablets, 37-43.

² According to Ménant (p. 49), 15 to 16 descriptions of persons may be enumerated, who are distinguished by the articles of dress, &c., which they seem to be offering as tribute.

the columns of the central hall differ from those of the apartments standing close to it. The floor of this part of the palace consisted of large marble slabs. M. Lassen is probably right in supposing that this great hall must have been a vestibule, not a presence-chamber, as was formerly believed. Its splendour was intended only to increase the awe of those who were to be admitted to an interview. This portico occupies two-thirds of the second platform, whereof it forms the principal edifice. Continuing towards the south you come to a third terrace requiring a further ascent of ten feet. The building upon it had two façades, one to the north, the other to the west, the principal staircase leading up on the western side. The walls surrounding the base of this terrace were also decorated with sculptures and contained an inscription of Xerxes in three languages (Ca), recording that the edifice (G. in Niebuhr) had been erected by Darius I.; nevertheless we believe that it was finished by Xerxes I. This inscription is again repeated on a column at the top of the staircase. This edifice is, likewise, in ruins; but isolated walls with windows, doors, and door-posts are still erect, since they were made of blocks too huge to be easily removed by modern Persians. It is 170 feet long and 95 feet broad, and contains three apartments; a great hall in the middle and two apartments attached to it by doors on the north and south sides. Excavations have shown that its roof was supported by 16 columns, there being in the northern vestibule 8 columns in two rows. The effigies carved in this edifice are of great interest. The northern and southern walls of the great hall exhibit again the image of the king, over whom hovers the image of Ahura Mazda.¹ On the eastern and western walls of the same hall we find a human figure—no doubt the king—fighting against various monsters; the same sculpture also represents a hero who has seized a lion and is thrusting a dagger into the heart of the animal.

Over several of the portals we find the image of the king, walking, habited in a long robe, with wide sleeves, its flowing skirts reaching to the ankles, high shoes, a sceptre in one hand, and a cup or a flower in the other. Two servants, much shorter than the king himself, hold above him an umbrella and a fly-flap. A short inscription (B), over the image in three languages, informs us that the king represented there is Darius I. On the straight cap as well as on the breast, hands, and shoulders, are holes in which, probably, ornaments of gold or precious stones were once fastened. The same image is also exhibited over a second portal. But here the king holds in the left hand a drinking vessel, in the right one a kettle. Near the side-doors to the south and west there are figures of spearmen, and round the windows runs a short inscription (L), which is repeated eighteen times in this part of the palace, having the Persian text on top, the Scythian on the left, and the Assyrian on

¹ [This image, I believe, represents only the *Fravashi* or the guardian spirit of the personage over whom it hovers.—*Tr. n.*]

the right. It must also be mentioned that on the western staircase there is an inscription of Artaxerxes III., which may be clearly accounted for from the changes which that king must have made in the palace of Darius. It is generally agreed that the building contained apartments, intended to be used by the king for ordinary purposes. This is also suggested by the bas-reliefs executed on the walls of its staircase, which again represent persons bearing other gifts than those already named above—a lamb, a melon, &c., in short, whatever is requisite for domestic use.

On one side of this edifice, about 82 yards towards the west, there are some indistinct traces of another structure, that seems to have stood quite on the top of the terrace. Herein the inscription (P) of Artaxerxes III. is repeated. We also observe some vestiges of another inscription in Assyrian cuneiform characters, which dates from Artaxerxes I. Perhaps that king had laid the foundation of the structure, which was afterwards finished by Artaxerxes III. Here bas-relief are in a good state of preservation. There are figures of persons bearing tribute including ivory which must probably have come from Egypt¹.

On the third terrace there are again some other considerable, though now very ruinous, edifices, to which stairs lead up. A great staircase may have formerly existed here, but no traces thereof are now to be seen. Along the walls of the staircase there are sculptured figures resembling those of the second platform. Above hovers the symbol of Ahura Mazda which, however, is not now quite distinct, and an inscription of Xerxes (Ea), which is elsewhere repeated (Eb). Of the two buildings in this part of the terrace, one (H) has been so completely destroyed, that little can be said about it. A second edifice (I) connected with the former by a sculptured passage is very similar to the structure (G) described above. It consists of a hall, close to which stands on the north side an apartment equal to it in length. This hall contains as many as 36 columns, and had on two sides similar apartments, each one having three partitions. Here, too, you will see sculptured figures. Here, also, the king is represented walking followed by two attendants holding above him the fly-flap and the umbrella. The inscription over the head of the king (C) records that he is Xerxes I.; his name is also engraved in several places on his robe. Xerxes seems to have been taller than his father; both these figures deserve a still more accurate study. That these buildings were used for domestic purposes, is quite evident from their sculpture. With these two edifices ends the palace towards this side. On the southern wall of this platform there are four inscriptions, which may be read from the plain below, and which deviate from the common arrangement. Two of these contain Persian texts, viz., the two important inscriptions (H) and (I). The other tablets contain each a Scythian and an Assyrian text, not mere translations of the Persian text, as is

¹ Comp. Herodotus III. 97, and Ménant, p. 64.

commonly the case, but each of them an independent inscription. The Scythian one states that Darius erected the palace, and that no one had ever built there before.¹ We admit, therefore, the certainty that Darius himself had raised the palace of Persepolis, which was afterwards completed by his successors. The Assyrian text is independent too, but adds nothing new to our knowledge.

Having surveyed all the portions of the palace of Persepolis which lie on the western side of the platform, we return to the gate of entrance to take a view of the remaining ones, which lie in a natural depression of the terrace towards the eastern side, and may, therefore, be reached without any staircase. On turning away from the main entry to the east, we soon reach the remains of the portico (O), evidently leading from the principal gate to an edifice (L), which must have been the largest of all the buildings in Persepolis for it measures 300 feet from north to south, and $247\frac{1}{2}$ feet from west to east. Formerly, this portico seems to have been a vestibule consisting of 16 columns. At the entrance there once stood two colossal beasts, the pedestals of which are still remaining, like those at the main gateway. The structure itself consisted of one large and single hall, the ceiling of which seems to have been supported by 100 columns in ten rows. It contains no inscription; only the front and southern walls are richly adorned with sculpture. Near the door the king is represented,² sitting on a throne, with his feet resting on a footstool, while behind him stands a eunuch with the fly-flap in his right hand, and a piece of cloth in the left. Behind him stands an armour-bearer with sword and bow, and another holding a spear. Before the footstool are deposited vessels for burning incense, behind which stands a person with his hand held up to his mouth, probably an envoy who has been admitted into the royal presence. Beneath the throne stand forty guards in four rows, their faces looking inwards toward the central throne. Above the king hovers a figure, which, no doubt, represents Ahura Mazda. On the right and left sides of this symbol are three animals; but it is not determined whether they are intended to represent dogs, bulls, or lions. All these rows are divided by borders studded with roses. A similar likeness of the king is found at the southern door lying opposite.³ The throne is not surrounded by body-guards, but there are fourteen men of various nationalities, who seem to support it. Behind the king is only an eunuch with a fly-flap, but no figure stands before him. Since the king is represented twice at each door, this image appears four times on each wall. At the doors of the eastern and western walls are again effigies of combats with fabulous beasts. That we have in this edifice the real presence-hall of Darius is unquestioned, and M. Niebuhr⁴ has ingeniously remarked that it

¹ Ménant, pp. 80-81.

² Cf. Niebuhr, tablet 29. Ker Porter, tablet 45, b.

³ Niebuhr, tablet 30.

⁴ Cf. Niebuhr, "Travels," p. 148.

is not without some purpose that we here find Darius always represented in a sitting attitude, not walking as in the structure (G.) Sideways from this edifice (L), nearer to (G), there is an immense pile of ruins. Among these ruins, which form the remains of a considerable building, are seen 5 stones $21\frac{1}{2}$ feet in height, covered with sculpture. They form the door-posts and part of the side-walls of a dilapidated building, which M. Lassen believes to be the hall of judgment. On each side of the entrance is the figure of the king, walking with two attendants ; on the walls, however, he is represented sitting in state on his throne, which is borne by divers persons. Behind the king stands a dignitary dressed nearly like him. Finally, the last building towards the south on this platform (K), contains a hall similar to the one described above. Though without side-chambers, still it has another hall in front. No inscription informs us of its use ; but on the walls we observe the king represented at one time as walking, and at another seated with his companions, and again we see the combats with fabulous beasts. Nothing can be stated as to the purposes of this building, and the hypothesis of Sir R. Ker Porter, that the sacred fire was here preserved, cannot be supported by any evidence.

These are the structures which constituted the great palace of Persepolis. We must add that the whole was liberally supplied with aqueducts, regarding which more accurate evidence is, nevertheless, wanting. That part of the castle which lay to the western side of the platform, and which was accessible by means of staircases, was probably occupied by the king and his family; whilst those buildings which were situated lower down, and faced the east, must have been intended for public occasions. Guests were probably not admitted within the castle ; suitable buildings for their accommodation in the neighbourhood were certainly not wanting at the time when the Persian kings kept court at Persepolis.

The remaining relics of Persepolis consist of three *dakhmas*, which are hewn in the side of the mountain towards which leans the terrace on which the castle stood. The first of these sepulchres lies to the east of the palace (L), the second only 400 paces further southward, the third a quarter of a league more to the south ; but the last was never finished. These sepulchres are cut half-way up the mountain-wall, about 300 feet above the level of the plain. Here the wall was cut smooth for the purpose. The façade had four pilasters projecting 8 inches from the wall. On both sides of these columns stand 6 spearmen in three tiers one above another. Between the two middle columns is a door cut three inches deep. It was indeed, an apparent door, since there was no real entrance through it. The shafts of the columns are crowned with the heads of double-bulls. Between these heads is the quadrangular head of a beam hewn in stone. On the columns rests an entablature, on which are represented the figures of 18 dogs or lions, 9 on each side, running in opposite directions, but separated in the middle by a lotus-flower. In

the middle of this entablature a figure is seen raising one hand and holding a bow in the other. It is no doubt, another likeness of a king. He stands before a fire-altar, over him soars the God Ahura Mazda. The other sepulchres have quite similar decorations, with some differences of detail too unimportant to be noticed. None of them was intended to be opened from the front; and we do not know in what way dead bodies were brought in. These *dakhmas* have now all been opened, though forcibly and in recent times; they are found to contain catafalques intended for the reception of biers. These catafalques are partly still in existence, and the marble, of which they are made, seems to have been brought there from distant places, since it is different from the mountain rock itself.

That none of these *dakhmas* in the so-called "Mountain of Sepulchres" near Persepolis belonged to the founder of the castle, the first Darius, might be inferred from an account of Ctesias, who states (*Pers.* 18), that Darius I. had, in his life-time, his *dakhma* constructed in the double mountain (ἐν τῷ δισσω ὄρει); he wished to visit it himself, but was restrained from doing so by the Chaldeans and his parents. His parents, however, actually visited the *dakhma*, but fell down and died, because the priests who drew them up to it, at the sight of some serpents, let go the ropes from terror. Now, this *dakhma* of Darius has actually been found. It is situated about a league north of the village which stands on the site of the ancient Istakhr.¹ There we see, over against the rising sun, a rock of white marble, about 200 paces in length, called Naqsh-i-Rustem by the natives; and in it we find four *dakhmas* at nearly equal heights of from 60 to 70 feet above the level of the plain. They are of similar architecture. The only inscription to be found belongs to the third, which we shall describe somewhat in detail instead of all the others. The base, the entrance, and the *dakhma* above it, give to the whole monument the form of a cross. The entrance does not differ from that of the sepulchres of Persepolis. Here also we see columns with heads of double-bulls, and between the two central columns is the shape of a door², but the real opening, which is below, is a quadrangular aperture of 4 feet 6 inches in length. Above the frieze is the representation of a catafalque in two tiers borne by two rows of persons (14 in each row). On the top of the catafalque stands the king with his right hand raised and a bow in his left. He stands before the fire-altar; between him and the fire appears Ahura Mazda hovering above, and a ball which is certainly meant to represent the Sun or Mithra. In the frame which surrounds this catafalque, stand six persons on each side of the king—on the right side men armed with spears, apparently bodyguards, on the left persons who are supposed to represent mourners. Above some of the latter are short inscriptions indicating who they are. At the left of the king stands

¹ Ker Porter, vol. I. pp. 516 *seq.* Niebuhr, II. pp. 155 *seq.*

² Ker Porter, plate 17.

Gaubarua (Gobryas), the lance-bearer of the king; below him *Aspaçanā*,¹ his arrow or bridle-keeper. Above one of the bearers of the royal throne is cut a name which may be *Macya*.² Side by side with this image are inscriptions in three different languages³. The first of these inscriptions consists of 60 lines (commonly known as N. R. a); it is the real epitaph of Darius I., and consequently of later date than the other inscriptions; the second, which is beneath the other (N. R. b), has been so mutilated by the fanaticism of the Mohammedans, that except the beginning, it is no longer possible to decipher its contents.

Not far from Naqsh-i-Rustem, near the village Hâjiâbâd are the ruins of a considerable edifice of the time of the Achaemenidae, but which has suffered too much injury to be now accurately traced. A column of great beauty is still standing; similar ones lie broken and scattered about. They are popularly known as the throne of Jamshid.⁴ Two buildings seem to have occupied the site. Still nearer to Naqsh-i-Rustem, and only about 35 paces distant from the first sepulchre, stands to this day a mysterious edifice resembling a tower, likewise belonging to the Achaemenidae.⁵ It was built in the form of a square, with edges projecting like pilasters, each side 22 feet 8 inches long and now about 35 feet high. The marble-blocks laid one above the other each 3½ feet in height, formed ten (according to others fifteen) layers. The length of each marble-block is very great, so that there are never more than two of them, though varying in length, making up the entire length of each side of the tower. The architrave consists of a single colossal marble-block 22 feet 8 inches long, prettily decorated with small beam-like extremities and quadrangular niches. The tower is walled in on all sides and has only towards the north a door 6 feet high, and 5 feet wide, surrounded by plainly decorated marble pillars. In the interior there is only one quadrilateral chamber with four sides, 12 feet by 12, and 15 to 16 feet high. What purpose it served cannot now be made out. Finally, we ascribe also to the period of the Achaemenidae the two fire-altars standing near one another,⁶ in the neighbourhood of the Naqsh-i-Rustem bas-reliefs, where the rock first turns towards the north, and then forms an amphitheatre extending towards the west. They stand on the same platform, are made of huge rocks, and have a height of from 12 to 14 feet.

As to the monuments of the Achaemenidae outside Persepolis, we need but mention them briefly, since they have not, as specimens of art, the same

¹ [Aspithanes, the quiver-bearer of Darius I.]

² [Probably the Matienans mentioned by Herodotus, VII. 72].

³ Since the statements of different writers contradict one another, we cannot venture to determine its position. Comp. Rawlinson, "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," vol. X. p. 289, note.

⁴ Ker Porter, vol. I pp. 514 *seq.*

⁵ Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 562.

⁶ Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 566.

importance as the mighty castle of Pers Theopolis. monument of Behistān, celebrated for its inscription, stands likewise on a rock, which rises nearly perpendicular from the plain to a height of 1,700 feet. Besides the inscriptions, there are also seen on this rock sculptures at such a height as to have been quite secure from mutilation by the Muhammedans, while they are perfectly visible from the plain. The Persian text of the inscription contains 416 lines (four columns containing 95 lines each and the fifth only 36). There are also Scythian and Assyrian translations, which render the text accurately on the whole, with slight characteristic additions here and there. In the middle of these inscriptions stands a bas-relief representing a scene in which king Darius is the conspicuous figure, which can easily be recognized. He wears the crown on his head, has his right hand raised and his left holding a bow. Behind him stand two dignitaries, of whom the one carries a bow, and the other a lance. The king is setting his foot on a prisoner lying on the ground. Before him stand nine persons with their hands tied behind them and all bound together by means of a rope. Short inscriptions inform us who is the person represented in each case. Above the whole scene hovers Ahura Mazda in the form in which he is commonly symbolized. Of the meaning of the whole scene we are sufficiently informed by the longer inscriptions. The captives are rebels, who were defeated and executed by Darius I., against whom they had revolted. No edifice in the neighbourhood of the inscription gives us any clue to the reason why Darius was induced to set just here the chief of his inscriptions; moreover, the beauty of its environment has attracted all spectators, and Ctesias describes the mountain (Comp. Diodorus, 2, 13) under the name of *Bagistānon*,¹ and erroneously ascribes the monuments on it to Semiramis. But the mountain was, he says, sacred to Zeus. The locality is well adapted to the planting of a park. It is, therefore, not improbable that Darius had here a park and a villa, where he resided when he sojourned in Media. Perhaps the memory of the defeat of the Median rebel Fravartis, which may have taken place not far from here, induced the king to immortalize his deeds on the very spot. There is yet a second monument of the Achæmenidae in Media, on Mount Alvend. It belongs both to Darius I. and his son Xerxes. Since the later kings are said to have dwelt on Mount Alvend, it might perhaps be supposed that their predecessors did so likewise; but such a hypothesis is not supported by the site of the inscription itself, for the way to the inscription-tablets leads from Hamadān through a mountain defile now called Abbāsābād. It is watered by a mountain-torrent and well cultivated at first, but it soon grows wild and lonely, until you come at last to a waterfall which dashes down a rocky wall of red marble. On the southern side of this marble-wall there are two niches

¹ *Bagistānon*, i.e., the resort of the Deity, is the original form of the modern name Behistān, of which the form Behistan, often used, is a mere corruption, occurring as early as in Yāqūt.

and in them the two inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes, generally known as (O) and (F). Of an inscription, which Darius caused to be cut on his Egyptian canal we have spoken already before.¹ It is composed in four languages and there are several repetitions, but unfortunately it is not in a good state of preservation.

Nor is the last monument of the two Achaemenian kings so often named, which is found in the remote north, near the town of Van in Armenia, without interest. It proves that Darius I. as well as Xerxes I. must have resided there. An inscription of Xerxes in three languages (K) stands on a steep rocky wall, which rises directly from the plain near Van, and which is now crowned by a Turkish fortress. The inscription is engraved where the rock is steepest, about 60 feet above the ground, but the characters are so beautiful and distinct that they can be read without difficulty from the plain. The inscription tells us that Darius I. here erected several magnificent palaces (*stāna*), and had also fixed upon a place for an inscription, which he had not caused to be executed during his life-time. It was only Xerxes, who, after his accession to the throne, ordered an inscription to be engraved there.

Since it was probably Darius I., who transferred the residence of the Achaemenidae from Persepolis to Susa, we should expect to find monuments of his activity principally in the latter town. But here the ravages of time have spared none of his buildings, nor any of those which preceded the Persian conquest; for we know that the Susa here mentioned, must be the very ancient town which had, already before the foundation of the Persian empire, sustained many a siege under the Assyrian kings. The place where it once stood, has been discovered by the English traveller, Mr. Loftus.² According to him, it lay between the Kerkha and the Dizful, in a level country where the distance between these two rivers diminishes to two English miles and a half. The ruins of this town lie about three-fourths of an English mile distant from the Kerkha, and about one mile and a half from the Dizful. During the period of its prosperity artificial canals must have supplied the necessary water, at the same time adding to its military strength. The dilapidated structures on the hills of Susa can by no means be compared with the grandeur of the ruins of Persepolis. Nevertheless Mr. Loftus has succeeded in finding among its remains the ruins of a palace, totally destroyed, which had some resemblance to the palace of Persepolis, like which it also stood on a high terrace. Traces of its columns are still seen rising on a façade of 330 feet in length, the

¹ [*Vide Spiegel, E.A. vol. III. p. 605*: "Nor is the completion of the Egyptian Canal, the construction of which was begun by Ramses II., continued by Necho, but finished as far as the Red Sea by Darius, of less importance. Near this canal there are several sculptured monuments with hieroglyphic and cuneiform characters, amongst which stands an inscription of Darius in Old Persian." *Tr. n.*]

² Comp. Loftus' "Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana," pp. 342 *seq.*

breadth of the building being 264 feet. In the middle there is a group of 36 columns in six rows, evidently the remains of a pillared hall of the kind common in Persepolis. Here also the bases of the columns are not everywhere similar; those of the principal hall are quadrangular, the others round, while the capitals were, it seems, of the same description as in Persepolis, but more elaborate and more like their models in wood. Four columns of the principal hall bore the Persepolis inscriptions in three languages; whereof the Persian text faced the south, the Scythian the west, the Assyrian the east. Although they have been much injured yet antiquarians have succeeded in deciphering easily the Persian text (S). These inscriptions were engraved by order of Artaxerxes II. and record that the edifice (*apadana*) was founded by Darius I., continued by Artaxerxes I., and finished by Artaxerxes II. Close to it there seems to have been erected a temple dedicated to Anāhita, as we find in several parts of the ruins a number of images of that *yazata* in *terra cotta*.

Besides architectural monuments, whatever antiquities we possess of the age of the Achæmenidae, are limited to some vases and seals bearing inscriptions in cuneiform characters. One of the seals probably belonged to Darius I. The vases come from Egypt and bear the name of Xerxes in four languages (Egyptian, Persian, Scythian, and Assyrian).

We shall conclude our examination of the works of art belonging to this epoch with some general observations. Notwithstanding the long time that has elapsed since the destruction of these old palaces, their outlines have still been preserved. This is owing to the fact that the Achæmenian princes employed, in their architecture, particularly stone, and not wood or brick, as was generally the custom in Assyria and Babylon. A peculiarity of these palaces consists in their splendid staircases leading from one storey to another. It is remarkable that the Persians are the only people of antiquity, who knew how to make architectural use of staircases. Moreover, it might be regarded as a defect in these structures that the floor is quite superfluously overloaded with columns, and further that the capitals of these columns followed too strictly their wooden originals¹. Among the bas-reliefs, the pictures of the king, sitting and walking, furnish a useful supplement to the descriptions of the ancients. We learn from them that the umbrella and fly-flap were already in olden times looked upon as emblems of royalty, and it is very probable that they may have been imported from India. The Avesta never speaks of these two insignia; while in the Book of Kings the umbrella has an Indian name (چتر) and even in one passage of the text it is expressly styled Indian. Further, we may conclude from these sculptures that the royal throne of Persia was not covered with cushions, but that it was simply a chair quite similar to the royal chairs used in Europe.

¹ Fergusson, I. pp. 189, 190.

In this, as well as in other points, it is shown that Old-*Irānian* art is closely allied to Assyrian art which is more modern.¹ The throne of Darius is, indeed, very similar to that of Sennacherib²; nevertheless, these two kings have very little resemblance in other respects. While Sennacherib leans on the bow in his right hand, holding two arrows in his left, the Persian king has in his right hand a staff, which has long since been acknowledged to be a sceptre, and in his left he holds an object that has been variously explained as a cup, or a lotus, or a nosegay. The last explanation seems to me the most probable, since in later descriptions, we find the king represented as holding a quince in his hand. On the sepulchral monuments as well as on the sculptured rock of Behistān, we have observed king Darius holding a bow in his hand. The Parthian kings are likewise said to have a bow while giving audience. In the image of Ahura Mazda the type of Assyrian art is still more apparent than in the figure of the king. Ahura Mazda is commonly represented in the form of a man having the tiara on his head. He is surrounded by a circle, to which are attached outspread wings. In some places the human figure is wanting, and the circle with the wings alone suffices for the symbol of the Supreme Being. Nor is such an emblem originally *Irānian*; it is found frequently in ancient monuments in Egypt, but especially in Assyria, where the god Assur is exhibited in similar form.³ Thus the idea of representing Ahura Mazda is of foreign origin, for the Persians could not consistently represent Him, as they regarded any attempt to picture the Deity as folly. The same dependence upon Assyrian art is shown also in the colossal figures of animals, which adorned the portals of the Achaemenian kings, the models of which have been discovered particularly among the ruins of Khorsābād. I am inclined, to believe that on the Assyrian model was grafted an *Irānian* idea, though foreign to the original type. Perhaps the Persian colossal beasts were intended to represent Mithra and the Sun-horses, for the *Irānians* venerated their king as the representative of Mithra on earth. Much perplexity has always been caused by these fabulous beasts, which are seen sculptured in the various halls of the palace of Persepolis, as being on the point of fighting with some person, probably the king. In one place we see the king seizing such an animal by its horns and thrusting a dagger into its breast. The body of the animal itself seems to have been made up of different parts of various beasts. It has the head of an eagle. Half its back is covered with feathers. It is standing erect and laying its forefeet on the right arm and breast of the king. No less remarkable is a second beast; its head seems to be that of a wolf, the forepart of the body and the forefeet belong to a lion, the hindfeet to an eagle. Its body is mostly covered with feathers, while its tail resembles that of a scorpion. In a third place the king is seen to raise a lion-cub from the ground and to fondle it.

¹ Vaux, "Niniveh and Persepolis," p. 330.

² *Vide* the illustration in Ménant, p. 82.

³ *Cf.* Ménant, p. 87.

A fourth beast has a horn on its forehead, a collar round its neck, and hoofs like those of a horse or bull. But it is without wings, while its long tail ends in a tuft of hair. In all these pictures the king constantly appears in the same calm attitude. At one time these beasts have been thought to be fabulous animals, at another people have sought to explain them from the Avesta, though without success. Here also the Persian figures are apparently connected with Babylonian models;¹ however, it is my conviction that these are not mere hunting scenes, the fabulous beasts are incompatible with such a theory. Here also, I believe, Irānian ideas underlie symbols of foreign origin, and M. Lassen may be right in considering these fabulous beasts to be monsters corresponding to those mentioned in the inscription (H)—personified evils and vices suppressed without any difficulty by the king's just government.

It has already been stated above that the history of the development of Irānian art shows a gap, which begins with the last period of the Achaemenidae and ends with the rise of the Sassanidae. So we are, for a space of six centuries, without any information about Irānian art; nevertheless, following Mr. G. Rawlinson's example,² we venture here to give a description of the ruins of Hathra. We cannot, it is true, assert with certainty, yet we may suppose with probability that they belong to the period of the Arsacidae. The town of Hathra did not lie in the Parthian territory properly so-called; still it had its own kings who were tributary to the Parthians. The town was well fortified and we know that Trajan as well as Severus failed to capture it; however, it cannot have long survived the dynasty of the Arsacidae. When Ammianus Marcellinus (25, 8, 5), visited the spot in 363 A.D., he found the town in ruins; and it may, therefore, be true, as some of the Oriental writers relate, that Hathra was destroyed under Shapur I. So this town, whose ruins still exist, must have been destroyed in the first half of the third century A.D. The ruins of Hathra are about an English mile in diameter.³ They are surrounded by a nearly circular wall of considerable thickness, the strength of which was further increased by towers erected at intervals of 60 paces. Outside the wall is a deep trench, which is now dry, and beyond this ditch is again a thick wall. The space inclosed within them is divided by a channel, running from north to south, into two unequal halves, the larger half lying on the western, the smaller on the eastern side. The latter does not seem to have been inhabited, and was, I believe, used as a burial-ground. But towards the west there are heaps of ruins, among which those in the middle of the circle are the most considerable. They seem to belong to a palace and a temple,⁴ and lie in a space inclosed by walls, forming an oblong quadrangle

¹ Comp. Ménant, p. 62.

² "The Sixth Monarchy," pp. 372 *seq.*

³ With the following compare Ross, "Journey from Baghdād to Al Hadhr" in the *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, vol. IX. pp. 467 *seq.*; and also Fergusson, vol. I. pp. 378 *seq.*

⁴ Not a temple, but a staircase, according to Fergusson (vol. I. p. 379).

800 feet long and 700 broad. The principal edifice seems to have had its entrance from the east, with a small wing lying on the west. It contained four small and three large chambers, and a room behind one of the large and three of the small ones. The large halls are 60 feet high, 90 feet long, and 35 to 40 paces broad. They seem to have been vaulted but had no windows, only receiving light by means of the seven great doors leading into the edifice. The outside of the chief façade is decorated with pillars on which are carved heads of men and women. Between the fourth and fifth doors stands a gryphon. The inside of the small apartments (30 ft. long and 20 ft. broad) has no decorations whatever. In the large chambers, however, are seen pillars ornamented at both ends, and two or three feet below the ceiling an ornamental border running all round, with two or three human heads carved beneath it.¹ The palace, like almost all the structures in that town, is built of limestone. The temple itself seems to have been surrounded by a vaulted passage into which light entered through two windows. The gate of this temple had a fine frieze bearing, I believe, a religious significance; the interior is without any decoration. It is probable, though uncertain, that this edifice had formerly an upper storey. The whole seems to have some resemblance to the Tāq-i-Kesra, mentioned in Ktesiphon. Perhaps the Parthian palace, which was destroyed by the Romans, was similar in appearance. The ruins of Hathra lead us to assume that it was built entirely after a Roman model. Nevertheless, its execution is so clumsy that we cannot possibly suppose that it was erected under the superintendence of a Roman architect.²

To the Parthian period are also attributed, with great probability, some bas-reliefs, which M. Bode has discovered in Susiana. They are seen in Teng-i-Salek in the province of Bakhtiāris. A group of 15 persons is arranged in two rows. The first person in each row is sitting, the rest are standing. They surround a figure, which appears, to represent a Magus, and which is comparatively in a state of good preservation. It wears trowsers, and over them an upper garment with sleeves and a knot over the breast, a pointed cap on the head, and a beard on its chin and upper lip. Besides, it wears plaited hair, which specially points to the Arsacian and Sassanian periods, whilst the more ancient and graceful arrangement of the hair in curls is Median (*Xen. Cyrop.* I. 32).³ The figure has its left hand on its breast, the right one is raised, beside it stands on a stone—some object formed like a sugar-loaf—adorned with garlands and ribbons. To the same period, likewise, pertains a second bas-relief, representing a rider in his long garment, just as he pierces with a spear an animal, probably a bear, rushing against him, while he holds

¹ Cf. the illustration in Ross.

² This is the opinion of Fergusson.

³ Herodotus, too, speaks of the long hair of the Persians (VI. 19).

a bow in his left hand. Here also appears under the tiara the rich hair characteristic of later times. On the same rock we observe also a third bas-relief, which seems to picture a woman reposing on a couch and holding in her hand a garland. Her rich hair is dressed in the ordinary manner; beside her stand three men, one without weapons by her couch, and two others at her feet, holding spears. That these bas-reliefs really belong to the Parthian period cannot positively be determined. More doubtful still is the question regarding another monument yet underscribed. The rock of Behistân contains, along with the inscriptions of Darius I., also a bas-relief of more recent date, but greatly damaged.¹ We can here make out another group of riders armed with lances, one of whom is crowned with an image of the Goddess of Victory. This bas-relief has been ascribed to the Parthian period, because of a Greek inscription, which is no less mutilated than the whole monument, but of which the following words can still be read distinctly:—ΑΛΦΑΣΑΤΗΣ ΜΙΘΡΑΤΗΣΠΕΓ (*ALPHASATES MITHRATESPEG*) and further down the words:—ΓΟΤΑΡΖΗΣ ΣΑΤΡΑΠΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΤΡΑΠ (*GOTARZES SATRAPES TΩN SATRAP*) and quite at the end:—ΓΟΤΑΡΣΗΣ ΓΕΟΠΟΘΡΟΣ (*GOTARSES GEOPOTHROS*). As regards Alphasates, I am at one with Mr. G. Rawlinson in assuming that we should regard it as another form of the name Arpakhshad.² But if from the name of Gōtarzes it might be concluded that that inscription owes its origin to the Arsacian king of that name, I cannot assent to such an opinion; for the Gōtarzes mentioned above does not call himself Great-King, but "Satrap of the Satraps," a title, which though otherwise uncommon, is identical with the Greek *σατράπης μεγ. στάνων* ("the Satrap of the Chiefs"), which is assumed by Behrām Chōbin (Theophyl., 4, 7). The Arsacian Gōtarzes is, furthermore, a son to Artabanus III.; and the concluding words of the inscription can, therefore, only imply that this Gōtarzes was a son of Geo, i.e. Gév. Now in the Book of Kings, Gév is really the son and not the father of Gudarz, which proves that the inscription does not, indeed, refer to the Gudarz of the legend. But, since the two names occur rather frequently, there may have been a Gōtarzes, whose father was named Gév. And since it was also the custom of the Sassanian kings to engrave their bas-reliefs side by side with the Achaemenian monuments, I am so much the more inclined to transfer this bas-relief to the period of the Sassanidae, as Mr. G. Rawlinson has also found similar Sassanian architectural monuments in its neighbourhood. As regards the use of the Greek language in this case, it is well known that even on the monuments of the first Sassanidae we meet with Greek inscriptions.

More doubtful still is a bas-relief found near Holvân. It represents a rider to whom a garland is being presented by a man standing near him. Be-

¹ Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 151 *seq.* Rawlinson, *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, vol. IX. p. 114.

² Cf. Rawlinson, *ibid.*, vol. IX. p. 111.

sides it is engraved rather a long inscription in unknown characters, which have not yet been deciphered, and so no definite opinion can possibly be formed about it. The same is the case with regard to the bas-reliefs seen by M. Ferrier in the country of the Aimaks and the Hazāres, the date of which will surely be determined by future investigations. To various ancient relics found in Warka and Niffer,¹ such as biers, vessels of glass or clay, etc., a Parthian origin has been ascribed; but here also the matter is not decided.

Our position becomes somewhat more satisfactory when we turn to the Sassanian period; however, its palaces and bas-reliefs cannot be considered collectively like those of the Achaemenian epoch, because they are scattered over different places. Of the Sassanian buildings so few have survived, that we cannot say much regarding architectural development in their time. The reason may be, that the Sassanidae were not peculiarly inclined to erect great edifices, or perhaps that their palaces lay, for the most part, in the low country near the Tigris, and so may have been mostly built of brick. The Sassanidae had, indeed, adopted the models exhibited in the buildings of Hathra,² yet in course of time such very considerable changes were introduced, that a perfectly new style arose among them. The large tunnel-like halls of Hathra were retained, but they only served for entrances. The separating walls were pierced by lofty arches, and so was formed a row of chambers. Furthermore, the Sassanidae knew how to adorn their halls with cupolas. Their buildings are always oblong quadrangles, with great doors in the middle, which form the chief entrance, and are as broad as the halls to which they lead. The chambers are joined to one another without passages between, so that we can pass directly from one to the other. Each of the Sassanian palaces contains an interior court whence one can find entrance to all rooms adjoining it. The depth of the buildings varies, being sometimes not much greater than the breadth, at others twice as great. In some cases the exterior wall, which, as a rule, contains several doors, has but a single entrance. The chief entrance, however, is always in the middle of the front; from it we can look into the entire edifice in the Tâq-i-Kesra to a depth of 115 feet. The cupolas or domes, which are numerous in the structures, are full of small apertures, which serve to admit light. In the walls there were also windows. The oldest and smallest of these palaces is that of Serbistân erected according to Mr. Fergusson, in 350 A.D.³ It is entered by three deep tunnel-like openings between which there are groups of three semi-circular pilasters, each extremity having again a single pilaster. The length of the palace is 138 feet, the breadth 122 feet. The entrances face the west. Through them we reach the halls, of which the

¹ Cf. Layard, "Niniveh and Babylon," p. 558. Loftus, "Chaldea and Susiana," pp. 202, 214.

² Cf. Fergusson, vol. I. pp. 382 *seq.*, and particularly G. Rawlinson, "The Seventh Monarchy," pp. 580 *seq.*

³ Cf. Fergusson, vol. I. p. 386.

central one at the principal entrance has the least depth. Thence we enter the largest chamber, which is vaulted. On the other side of this large chamber there is a court upon which doors open from the various apartments. The large chamber leads also into halls towards the north and south.—The palace of Firûzâbâd, which must have been built, according to Mr. Ferguson, about 450 A.D., is larger. It is about 390 ft. long and 180 ft. broad; it has only one entrance, a large gate, which is about 50 feet high and faces the north. It leads first into a vaulted hall, 90 ft. long and 43 ft. broad. On each side there are two similar chambers, though smaller in size. We next enter through small but elegant doors three vaulted chambers which occupy the whole breadth of the edifice, each about 43 feet square, the vault rising 70 feet high. The door and false windows—the latter being intended only for ornament—point to the influence of the Persepolitan style. These vaulted chambers lead again into some smaller apartments and thence into a court 90 feet square, into which open again various apartments decorated on the inside with false windows, which however, are executed far less skilfully than those in the vaulted chambers. The exterior of the palace was very prettily adorned by means of long narrow arches and long cylindrical pilasters. The whole has an appearance of stern simplicity, and is altogether less handsome than the smaller palace in Serbistân. The most spacious of the Sassanian palaces is the celebrated Tâq-i-Kesra, the only surviving relic of the ancient Ktesiphon. The Oriental historiographers, who regard it as a marvel of splendour, sometimes ascribe it to Khosrav I. and sometimes to Khosrav II. It was probably founded about 550 A.D., and, therefore, only begun under Khosrav I.¹ What remains of it, is a mere fragment, and it is impossible to restore the plan of the whole structure. The façade resembles that of the palace of Firûzâbâd, but is much more splendid, being 370 ft. broad and 105 ft. high. The remains still in existence compose the entrance and a vaulted hall, 72 ft. broad, 85 ft. high, and 115 ft. deep; and we might here assume that there likewise stood chambers on both sides as in the other palaces. A similar relic in Irân itself is the Takht-i-Bostân, which we shall describe below. Another Sassanian palace was unexpectedly discovered a short time ago at Mashita in the country of Moab.² It must have been erected by Khosrav II., about the time when this sovereign marched victorious to the neighbourhood of Byzantium, and it proves that this king strove to retain all the conquests he had then made. The whole palace is an extensive quadrangle of 500 ft. in each direction, but only the interior portion of about 170 feet square was completed. The palace was evidently intended to be a hunting-seat for the king near the edge of the desert. It is built of brick quite after the model of

¹ According to Theophylactus (5, 6 *seq.*) Justinian sent to Khosrav I. Greek workmen as well as the materials for the erection of his palace.

² Comp. H. B. Tristram, "The Land of Moab" (London, 1873), pp. 195 *seq.* Mashita (مَشِيْتَا) means "winter-quarters."

the other Sassanian palaces. A vaulted hall, which was formerly crowned by a cupola, forms the centre. There are also on each side eight chambers, with courts between them. The entrance lay on the north side, whence three vaulted doorways, separated only by columns of hard white stone, led into the building. The capitals of these columns are like those which came into fashion in the age of the Emperor Justinian, a circumstance which helps us to determine the date of the edifice. A second building is separated from the first by a court of nearly 200 feet square ; but it seems to have been intended for other purposes. Probably it contained rooms for the guards. The exterior of this palace is much more ornate than the other palaces of the Sassanidae, which evidently proves that Greek workmen were specially employed in building it, as was no doubt the case when the Sassanidae erected palaces within the limits of their own empire. The Book of Kings does not at all deny that Greek, as well as Indian workmen, were employed in constructing the Tâq-i-Kesra. We know that Khosrav I carried off the finest works of art of Damascus into his own country, when that city was destroyed ; so it is hereby acknowledged that Irānian artists could not vie those of Greece.

We shall now consider the bas-reliefs of the Sassanidae, which we find for the most part in the neighbourhood of the Achaemenian monuments, a clear proof that the first Sassanidae were still very probably conscious of their connection with the older Southern Irānian dynasty. It is especially in Persis that we meet with monuments of that kind. If we pass from Murghāb to Persepolis, we find the first Sassanian monument in the valley of Hâjîābād, which is bounded on the western side by the rocks of Naqsh-i-Rustem. An English mile north of this village, we observe in a rocky cavern a long inscription of Shapur I., without any other monuments of art. These begin at first with Naqsh-i-Rustem itself. On the same rock on which the Achaemenian Sepulchres are found, though only a little lower, we meet with six bas-reliefs of the Sassanian period, of which the first is seen after passing the easternmost sepulchre. The two principal figures face each other, and each holds a garland trimmed with ribbons.¹ According to more ancient drawings, the ribbons are shown to have hung down over the figure of a child, which has now become quite indistinct. The person holding the garland with his right hand is the king, who wears a balloon-like cap with streaming ribbons, such as are often seen on coins. The hair of his head is rich and flowing, as is common with the Sassanidae. In his ear he wears a pearl. His wide garment is kept together by means of a girdle. The Second figure has been variously explained as that of a woman or a eunuch. It wears a mural crown for head-dress with flowers and fluttering ribbons ; the hair hangs down the shoulders in plaits. A third person behind the king, with a raised fore-finger and a Phrygian cap, which appears to terminate in the head of a horse, is generally considered to

¹ Cf. Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 530, and the illustration, pl. 16.

be a servant. Some believe they recognize in the figure of the king a resemblance to the image of Vararan V. on his coins. Since Sir R. Ker Porter wrote, it has, therefore, been assumed that we have here a picture of this Vararan, and Sir George Ouseley also believes he has made out the name of that king in a long inscription which stands by the side of this bas-relief. As we not unfrequently meet with similar pictures, I must here remark that the garland or ring, appearing on these monuments, seems to me to be no other than what we observe, in the older monuments, in the hand of Ahura Mazda, possibly a symbol of the Empire of the Universe. Hence it follows that the second figure that holds the ring, may have been intended to represent a deity; for I do not believe that the Sassanidae were specially inclined to share the honour of their victories with any human creature. The person standing behind the king might also be regarded rather as a divine than a human being; it certainly represents a supernatural adviser.

On the second bas-relief is figured a combat,¹ in which an Irānian king, perhaps the same as in the foregoing, pushes with his lance a retreating enemy before him. Behind the king is carried a standard. The ordinary supposition that it represents the victory of Vararan V, over the sovereign of Tūrān, seems to me to be very uncertain.

The third bas-relief is one of the best known, and imitations of it are found elsewhere too.² It pictures an Irānian king crowned and on horseback. His left hand is laid on the pommel of his sword, while with his right he holds the hands, covered with sleeves, of a man standing near him. The latter wears the Roman costume. So, too, does a second figure, that kneels in a suppliant attitude before the king. The same figure appears again behind the king as in the first bas-relief. It is commonly believed that we have here the scene of the capture of the emperor Valerian by Shapur II., in which the kneeling figure is the emperor himself, while the one standing is Cyriades, who was put into his place. Since the same picture occurs again in the ruins of Shāpur and Dārābgerd, this supposition is to a certain extent probable.

The fourth bas-relief is much like the second;³ but here the lance of the retreating adversary is broken. The crown of the king, which differs entirely from the ordinary shape, is of some interest.

In the fifth bas-relief there again appear two riders with the ring.⁴ Here we find inscriptions, too, which inform us that the horseman, who wears the mural crown, is Ahura Mazda, and that the second one who receives the ring as the emblem of royalty, and behind whom stands a person with a fly-flap, is no

¹ Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 537 and pl. 20.

² Ker Porter, p. 540 and pl. 21.

³ *Ibid*, vol. I. p. 544 and pl. 22.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 548 and pl. 23.

other than Ardeshir I., the founder of the Sassanian dynasty. Beneath the feet of each rider lies a king, evidently dead. The one on the side of Ahura Mazda wears serpents instead of hair ; he may be supposed to be a usurper.

Lastly, the sixth bas-relief pictures a king, standing on a kind of platform, with his nobles seated round him.¹

Advancing further from the rock of Naqsh-i-Rustem in the direction of Persepolis, we come first to the inconsiderable ruins of Istakhr, the ancient capital of Irān, the strong citadel of which was built upon a mountain. According to Oriental opinion the Sassanian kings were reluctant to build on the very ruins of their predecessors, and, therefore, established their new residence in their immediate neighbourhood. Between Istakhr and Chihilminār there is, on the sepulchral mountain of Persepolis, a roofless grotto cut in the rock, having its three walls on the north, south, and east covered with sculpture.² On the southern wall we find again a representation of the two riders holding a ring ; but the engraving is not so skilful, and evidently executed by less practised hands. Besides Ahura Mazda and the king, all the other subordinate characters are here wanting. On the eastern wall we find a repetition of the scene including the attendants, but here the two principal characters are standing. On the northern wall we see the picture of a horseman together with his attendants on foot. The heads of the rider and of the horse have been effaced ; but the inscriptions record that Shapur I. is here represented.

To Persis belong a few more bas-relief found by Sir R. Ker Porter in the neighbourhood of Shiraz.³ One group consists of a woman holding her flowing veil in the left hand, and stretching out the right one to a person who is offering her a flower. As the latter wears no crown, I doubt whether it is the figure of the king or not. The image of the Sassanian king appears twice on the same wall, in the usual manner, but badly executed.

Finally, we must again mention here the ruins of the city named Shâpûr. They are six leagues distant from the town of Kâzerûn, on a mountain to the north, in a romantic neighbourhood. The ruins have a circumference of about two leagues. On a rising ground which is at right angles to the eastern side of the mountain, but quite isolated, are the ruins of a castle, which seems to have had mighty towers and walls covered with bas-reliefs of the Sassanian period. In the first we see the horsemen, already familiar to us, and a man lying prostrate at their feet. The figures are colossal, but are much damaged by time. Before one of the riders kneels a man in a supplicating posture. The second bas-relief is by far more important and is divided into nine panels. In the middle panel the king appears on horseback, wearing the Sassanian

¹ Ker Porter, p. 551 and pl. 24.

² *Ibid*, p. 371, pl. 27. Niebuhr, pl. 32 A.

³ *Ibid*, p. 706, pl. 57.

crown and the coiffure waving behind. Underneath the hoofs of his horse is again the outstretched corpse of a vanquished enemy. Before him kneels a man in Roman costume, while two figures stand behind, one of which is beardless and wears a Phrygian cap. The king is holding the hands of a man in Roman costume, while a winged genius hovers above him. Perhaps in earlier times there was also an inscription. In the second of the principal panels, which is to the left side of the middle one, are two divisions, each of which contains six figures on horseback, all raising the right hand and the fore-finger. They are the suite of the king, probably his counsellors. The third panel, on the right of the middle one, has six sub-divisions, each with three persons carrying various articles, which seem to be partly building implements, partly presents. These figures, like those of the middle panel, have a height of 5 ft. 9 inches, while the riders on the left of the king are only of about half this height. Some more bas-reliefs are found on the opposite bank of a little river. Here we see, in a relief divided into five panels, the king in the midst, and represented, which is indeed exceptional, *en face*. He grasps with his left hand his sword; his right is stretched out. As to the two divisions on his right the characters in the uppermost tier raise their hands and fore-fingers; in the second are probably servants, one of whom holds a richly caparisoned horse by the bridle. On the left side of the king are two more rows of persons, the chief of whom carries two human heads, while a little boy clings to the skirt of his garment. The fourth panel again exhibits the images of two colossal riders holding the coronal ring, which are said to be particularly well executed. The fifth relief is a hunting-piece, but much damaged. We recognize in it the person of the king on horseback, with a bow and two arrows in his hand as well as the heads of men, horses, and camels.

A hundred steps further there is another relief cut in a concave form. Its subject seems to be very much the same as that of the second and third reliefs. The middle piece, which takes up the greatest space, exhibits the ordinary picture of the victorious king with a dead body lying at his feet, and the Roman kneeling by the side of his horse. But here we have beside the king a man in Sassanian costume, offering the coronal ring to the king. Farther to the right there stand, in the first row, a number of persons with folded arms; in the second and third rows persons carrying baskets, etc.; while in the corner is a man leading a lion by a chain. In the fourth row, directly opposite to the king, are six persons in loose plaited garments, who might, therefore, be supposed to be Indians. They carry various objects, or lead different animals, such as horses, elephants, &c. Amongst them we see men in Roman costume, and a chariot with two horses harnessed to it. On the left side there are five troops of riders, who are apparently the king's retinue. Finally, we have to mention a finely constructed edifice which is a quarter of a league from the sixth relief. Near its entrance there formerly stood several sphinxes, some traces of which may still be recognized.

In Media, as in Persis, the Sassanian kings erected their monuments close to those of their ancestors. About two *farsangs* or four miles from Behistān, towards the town of Kirmānshāh, we still observe the scanty remains of a palace which Mr. G. Rawlinson ascribes to the Sassanians. Eight or nine bases and capitals are all that may still be seen; but the distance of the first of these ruinous bases from the last is about 300 paces, and it, therefore, seems that an edifice of considerable size must have previously stood here. On the same mountain tract, which contains the monuments of Darius, but further to the west, towards Kirmānshāh, there are sculptured engravings which are now known by the name of Tāq-i-Bostān, i.e., the "Vault of the Garden," or also of Takht-i-Bostān, "Throne of the Garden." The romantic narratives of the modern Persians profess to give the name of the artist, to whom we owe these monuments. He is supposed to have been called Ferhād and to have loved Shīrīn, the beautiful wife of Khosrav II. In her honour, it is said, Ferhād executed these figures and erected the adjoining structures.—Here we must remark that the Book of Kings does not give the least hint of this romantic love-story,¹ which seems to have been invented in later times and without any historical foundation.—The carvings begin at a place where a limpid brook rushed forth from the rocky wall and flows into the river Kārāsū. Above this brook there is a relief called by the neighbouring people the "Relief of the Four Calenders."² It contains the figures of four men, one of whom lies prostrate on the ground. Over his head stands another figure wearing a mural crown surmounted with the ornamental ball, so common among the Sassanians, and a necklace of pearls and a diadem. The hair is thick. A light flowing garment is fastened together over the breast and a girdle goes round the waist. The others are similarly dressed. The second person wears a close-fitting helmet with the Sassanian ball, and four ribbons of unequal length fluttering behind. Both hold the well-known coronal ring; and, I believe, we do not err if we regard the first to be Ahura Mazda, and the second to be a Sassanian king. Behind the king we observe a person with a great halo round his head and a kind of sceptre in his hand, standing perhaps on a sun-flower. In my opinion the image represents Mithra, the guardian *yazata* of the royal family.³

Not far from the bas-relief just described, a staircase leads to a platform, whereon we discover the traces of a statue, which must formerly have stood there. The broken statue itself lies in the rivulet below and is the figure of a king. But the most precious monuments are engraved in two grottoes at the foot of the rock.⁴ The larger one is 24 feet broad, 21 feet deep, and the vault

¹ The story is briefly related in the Persian Tabari (2, p. 298), and at length by Ker Porter (vol. II. pp. 179 *seq.*)

² Comp. Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 169, 191 *seq.* and pl. 60.

³ This image is also supposed to represent the Irānian Prophet.

⁴ Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 169 *seq.*, and the illustrations, pls. 62-64.

is 50 feet high. The walls of the grotto are neatly polished. The entrance to the hall is through a vaulted gate, as is generally the case in Sassanian palaces. Over the arch there is a half-moon, on either side of which is a figure quite resembling an angel holding in the one hand the well-known coronal ring, in the other probably a goblet. Similar figures are also found on the Arsacian coins as well as on some Sassanian monuments. Perhaps the idea was borrowed from the old manner of representing Ahura Mazda. On entering through the doorway, we observe the colossal figure of a rider carved between two columns of the Corinthian style. It is clad in mail, extending from the face to the knees, and beneath it are indications of a richly embroidered garment. In the right hand is a shield, a heavy lance rests on the shoulder. The horse also is partly covered with armour. Here still exist traces of an inscription in the Irānian and Greek languages, but too indistinct to be deciphered. In the panel above the rider there are three figures; the middle one is richly clothed and apparently represents the king, wearing a crown with the ball or globe, and the rich plaited hair. Over his robe and trowsers, which seem to have been nicely embroidered, he wears a coat-of-mail, the left hand holding the hilt of his sword. On his left there is a female figure, likewise magnificently dressed, pouring water from a vessel in her hand. The figure on the right wears a diadem and a long beard, a mantle fastened over the breast hangs over its shoulders; it offers to the king the coronal circlet so often referred to. I do not doubt but that the female figure on the left represents Anāhita, and the figure on the right Mithra. The pictures on the side-walls of the grotto are easily explained. They are hunting scenes. On one of the reliefs the king is represented on horseback, armed with bow and arrows, while an umbrella is held over him. The king is pursuing a number of antelopes; the horsemen overtake them; and a little further on, the animals are seen slain. Behind the king is a company of musicians. In one of the lateral panels we behold a number of men riding on the backs of elephants, who drive the game towards the king; in the opposite panel we see camels carrying the slaughtered animals. On the second wall a boar-hunt is represented. The scene is apparently a lake, the banks of which are covered over with dense bushes and forests. Here also we see elephants endeavouring to force the boars across the midst of the lake, where there is, in a boat, a man much taller than the rest, and richly dressed in the act of shooting at the approaching animals. A little farther off, in another boat, there is a second man similar to the former, but not so tall, having round his head a circle, which is supposed to represent a nimbus. I believe this is a two-fold representation of the king. The second person is in the act of taking a bow from the hand of a servant; on his side stands a female harper. Female musicians are also seen in other boats. On the edge of the relief we see persons engaged in piling the boars, which have been slain, on the backs of elephants.

The second grotto is by far less spacious than the first.¹ It is only 19 ft. broad and 12 ft. deep; its exterior is not decorated. Opposite the entrance we see a bas-relief exhibiting two figures, both dressed quite alike; they wear crowns and the thick hair of the Sassanidae. Their costume is not particularly handsome; but they wear necklace, and the hilts of their swords are ornamented. Two inscriptions tell us who they are. One is Shāpūr, 'King of Kings,' son to Ormazd; the second Shāpūr, 'King of Kings,' son to Shāpūr and grandson to Ormazd; they are therefore, Shāpūr II. and Shāpūr III. The workmanship is rather clumsy; the hunting-scenes and the ornaments at the entrance of the first grotto are of much higher artistic value. If we further mention the unfinished bas-relief found by Sir Robert Ker Porter in the ruins of Rai, we believe that we have completed the list of the most important Sassanian monuments.

We have still to speak briefly of Irānian coins. The Dareiki have already been referred to (page 661).² The Arsacian coins need not be discussed here on account of their Greek character, though the effigies and ornaments of the Arsacian kings deserve also the attention of the Irānian archæologist.

As to the Sassanian kings, we find the finest specimens of their coinage in the beginning of their dynasty under Ardashir I.³ From the time of Shāpūr II. they deteriorate perceptibly and degenerate under Peroses to the verge of barbarism, and continue so under the succeeding sovereigns. Under Khosrav II, there appears some improvement, but after that there is no real progress, and the same defects appear in the coins of the last Sassanidae.

As for music, we can only remark that it was always popular in Irān; but we do not know anything more definite about it. Vararan V. was very fond of music.⁴ He not only had female Greek lute-players in his suite, but

¹ Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 187 *seq.* and pl. 65.

² ["It was a pure gold coin struck by order of Darius I. It represented the king in a kneeling posture, habited in his flowing garment with the royal tiara, holding in his right hand the royal staff, perhaps a lance or a sword, and in his left a bow. According to Tabari the king was in olden time represented on both sides of the Dirhem; on the one seated on the throne with the crown on his head, on the other on horseback with the lance in his hand."—*Tr. n.*]

³ Comp. Mordtmann, *Zeitschrift ddmG.* vol. VIII. 7. As for the other relics of the Sassanidae we refer to Mr. Ed. Thomas, "Early Sassanian Inscriptions, Seals, and Coins." London, 1873.

⁴ [*Cf.* J. Darmesteter, "The Origin of Persian Poetry":—"One day king Behram Gor of historic and legendary memory was at the feet of his mistress, the beautiful Del Ārām. He told her of his love, she spoke to him of her own. Their words were an echo of the harmony in which their hearts beat together. It is thus that poetry, rhyme, and rhythm took births in Persia.—The legend is beautiful but a little too late . . . Seven centuries before Behram Gor and Del Ārām, the companions of Alexander the Great had heard the poets of Susa sing the loves of Zariāres and Odatis . . . But all this poetry is lost to us; what is left is a remnant devoid of all charms, the famous Gāthās of the Zend Avesta, rhythmical sermons which breathe irreproachable morals, and which offer all the poetic interest of a catechism." *Vide* 'Indian Spectator,' Aug. 15, 1886.—*Tr. n.*]

he is even said to have introduced Indian music in Persia. At the court of Khosrav II. two singers, Bārbad and Sargash (Sergius), are mentioned in the Book of Kings. We may suppose them to have been Greeks, and there can be no reason to doubt that Greek as well as Indian music was not unfrequently heard at the court of the Irānian sovereigns.

THE IRANIAN ALPHABETS.

THE ancient Persians made use of two distinct characters. So early as in the Inscriptions of Darius the term *dipis* denotes an inscription; and this word may be derived from a verbal root *dip*, which has been preserved also in other Irānian languages in different derivatives. To this root we might especially trace the Greek word *διφύερ* which was employed by Ktesias and other Greek writers as a name for the Persian Annals; but which, as may be gathered from the testimony of Herodotus (V. 58), was used at an early period to denote a book or a manuscript. Herodotus seems to believe that the word was originally Greek, and perhaps derived from *δέφω*; but this opinion is distinctly erroneous, for the word is strictly Persian and comes from *dip*; even to the present day the Persian word *defter* means a book. From the same root we have the words *dibistān*, "a writing-room, a school"; *dēvān* or *divān*, which means "a writing book, or chamber" in the Armenian archives, and the Mod. Persian word *diwār*, Arm. *dpīr*, "a writer." As regards the original meaning of the root *dip*, I suppose it to be identical with the Skr. *lip*, "to besmear," and, therefore, also contained in the words *lipi* ("spreading over, writing") and *lipikara* ("white-washer, writer"). This supposition is not contradicted by the fact that the inscription, which Darius calls *dipis*, is cut on rocks, since we know that the engraved letters were also overlaid with gold or painted. On the contrary, this view is confirmed by the Mod. Persian words دیوار *dēwār*, "wall," and دلباج *dēbāj*, "brocade," which must be traced to the same root. Another Old Persian expression for writing is *nī-pīsh*, which is also used by Darius and contained in the Mod. Persian *nivishtan*. It seems to have migrated further westward and to have found a place in the Slavonian dialect, wherein words like *pismo*, "writing," &c., point to the existence of a root *pīsh*, to which might also belong the Old Prussian words:—*peisaton*, "written"; *peisalei*, "writing." Accordingly, we are able to point to the use of two distinct terms for the art of writing among the Southern Irānians. However, the case is different with respect to Northern Irān. Here we find a name for a written document only in the word *naska*, which may be identified as a word borrowed from the Arm. յոճ "to transcribe." But this etymology is uncertain, and no other name for writing exists. Wherever books are referred to, allusion is frequently made to memory (*darethra*) and recitation (*marethra*). This circumstance shows beyond doubt that the sacred lore was originally impressed on the memory of scholars by tradition and oral instruction. It would be rash to infer from this circumstance that in olden times the use of writing was unknown to the Northern Irānians; whereas Herodotus states that Deioces, after his accession to the throne, caused most of the events of his reign to be recorded in

* Translated from the German of Dr. F. Von Spiegel *Iranische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. III. bk. VII., chap. II. pp. 759-771.

writing. The fact, however, is that even at the present day we can only put forth conjectures as to the character of the Northern Irānian writing.

On the other hand, our knowledge regarding the style of writing in Southern Irān reaches as far as the beginning of the Achaemenian monarchy, especially if we ascribe, as we probably may, the small inscription in Murghāb to the founder of that dynasty. The earliest form of Southern writing known to us is found in the inscriptions of the Achaemenidae; consequently we have the advantage of its having been transmitted to us in the very form in which it was originally inscribed. It is a variety of the so-called cuneiform writing, but one differing considerably from all others, which it surpasses in simplicity. This circumstance gives strength to the theory of the comparatively later origin of the Old Persian cuneiform writing, which is locally the most Eastern species of its kind. A more intricate system of cuneiform writing is found in translations standing side by side with the Old Persian texts. In Northern Irān we meet with inscriptions following this intricate cuneiform system, engraved by kings still unknown to us, in Media as well as in Armenia. Western Irān, the land of the Euphrates and the Tigris, however, is specially famous for such specimens of cuneiform writing. On the contrary, not a single line in cuneate letters has yet been discovered eastward of Persis. Although M. Ferrier thought he had met with such inscriptions in Balkh and Farah, his belief has not been confirmed by later research, and it must, therefore, be regarded as erroneous. That the cuneate writing was confined to the western part of the Irānian kingdom, is sufficient proof that it could not have been derived from the East. It would be more reasonable to give it a northern origin; but the most probable view is that it came from the West. In dealing with this subject we need not be struck by the dependence of the Southern Irānian kingdom upon Northern and Western Irān, for we have lighted upon similar facts in other parts of our study of Irānian civilization. We repeat that the use of cuneiform writing throughout Persia proves that the latter country, as well as the whole western frontier of Irān, was more or less familiar in ancient times with the civilization of Babylon and Nineveh. Yet the specific identification of the Old Persian cuneal system with the more ancient systems, presents no insignificant difficulties. The Old Persian cuneiform writing is the only system which really deserves to be called an alphabet; all other varieties are mere syllabaries. Several peculiarities in the Old Persian writing make its identification with the *Anarian* systems impossible. There are signs which merely stand for the vowels *i* or *u*, but none for *a*. The letter, which must be followed by *a* in reading, denotes at the same time certain vowel-less consonants. These are some of the characteristics considerably differing from the earlier systems, which contain certain signs for syllables, *e.g.* *ru*, *ri*, &c. The letters *m* and *v* are distinguished in the Old Persian alphabet, but not in the earlier cuneiform systems, Assyrian writing has no signs for

aspirates, while the Old Persian carefully distinguishes the hard aspirates at least. These peculiarities do not allow us to connect the Old Persian alphabet either with the *Anarian* or the Assyrian syllabary : on the contrary, they exhibit some points of contact with the Babylonian. The ideographic sign for king (which would formerly have been read *naqa*) is taken from the Babylonian, and lately M. Oppert has found altogether nine such signs corresponding to the Babylonian ones.¹ This circumstance supports the theory which ascribes a Babylonian origin to the Old Persian alphabet ; and M. Oppert (p. 244) supposed that it was for the first time systematized by Cyrus or at his command, after the occupation of Babylon, by the Persians. For this purpose the Old Persians seem to have fixed on 36 words which were represented in Babylonian by ideograms, to each of which they attached the value of a single character. The alphabet was rendered still simpler by bringing into the new system only angular and single cuneal signs—the latter being horizontal as well as vertical—from three to five of which fundamental elements the different letters were formed.² In this way we may account for the change from the syllabic systems to the method of writing in letters ; however, we are at a loss for any explanation of the high proficiency attained by the Persians, which led to their invention of an alphabet to replace the cumbersome mode of writing in syllables. Besides, it is scarcely possible to assume that the cuneiform writing was the only method which people could make use of during the rule of the Achaemenidae. It is true that it has many advantages for monumental inscriptions ; nevertheless, its incongruities must have been felt in the ordinary intercourse of life. It is impossible to suppose that letters, edicts,³ or literary works, for instance the royal annals mentioned by Ktesias, were written in cuneal letters. It is more probable that, along with the cuneiform alphabet, another system of writing was in use for epistolary or literary purposes. What this system was and whether it sufficiently corresponded in principle to the former, we cannot of course state, for we know nothing about it. But since a regular alphabet was known in the countries west of their own, besides the cuneiform system,⁴ it is likely that the Old Persians may have borrowed a similar mode of writing from Babylon or Assyria and adapted to it their own language. In any case, however, it could not have been perfectly suitable for employment in the Old Persian dialect, owing to the natural want of harmony between Indo-Germanic language and a Semitic alphabet. But such inconsistencies have lasted to the present day through the whole of Irānian history ; while the inconvenience

¹ Cf. Oppert, "*Sur la formation de l'alphabet perse*," *Journal Asiatique*, 1874, pp. 238 seq.

² In Oppert (*ibid.*, pp. 242 seq.) we find a table of Babylonian characters from which the Old Persian alphabet is supposed to have been developed.

³ Herodotus I. pp. 124, 125.

⁴ Comp. Schrader, *Die Assyrisch-Babylon. Keilinschriften*, p. 167.

arising from the use of a Semitic alphabet need not have been insuperable, since it was used only by natives, whose knowledge of the spoken language must have made up for the deficiencies of the written alphabet.

The period of the Achaemenidae was followed by the empire of the Parthians; and we have already stated that the Arsacidae stamped their coins with Greek legends in Greek characters. But, on the other hand, a number of coins are still preserved, which owe their origin to the age of the Arsacidae, probably to the satraps (viceroys), and which are inscribed in the native language and character. Upon these coins M. Levy has based an elaborate and admirable treatise—his “History of Irānian Writing in the Parthian Period.”¹ Most of the coins alluded to in this work belong to Hamadān, Sherāz, and Kermān,² i.e., to the South and West of the kingdom. That they owe their origin to the Irānian can be clearly demonstrated, since they exhibit the device of a fire-altar and a man standing before it in prayer. On several of them we observe also the image of Ahura Mazda himself, similar to the symbol of Him found on earlier monuments. The effigy of the king also supports this view. Indeed, he does not wear the high tiara of the Great King, but he has an Irānian head-dress, which on the later coins is evidently the *Patidāna*. On one of these coins, however, the king is shown holding a sceptre, a flower, and a goblet, as on the monuments of Persepolis. All these circumstances evince the correctness of M. Levy’s theory that these coins must be ascribed to the Irānian satraps. This seems to have been indicated also by the position of the king’s face, looking towards the right, whereas the image of the Great King always looks towards the left. The coins bear legends in indigenous characters; the letters belong to the Aramaic alphabet of the fourth and third century B.C., as it was used on monuments in Asia Minor, as well as on the coins, seals, monumental columns, and papyrus fragments discovered in Egypt.³ Hence it might be inferred that the Persian satraps, to whom the coins belonged, caused them to be struck, if not under the sovereignty of Alexander, then under the Seleucidae and throughout the whole period of the Arsacidae; and during this epoch a species of Aramaic writing may have been naturalized in Irān. Inscriptions with traces of a similar character have been found also in Holvan and Khuzistān.⁴ They seem to have been akin to the Nabataean and Palmyrene alphabets, but the samples of them now existing are not quite sufficient to allow of any definite opinion being formed regarding them. The question as to the origin of those inscriptions will, therefore, remain undeter-

¹ Cf. Levy, *Beiträge zur aramäischen Münzkunde Erāns und zur Kunde der älteren Pehlevischrift*, *ZdmG.* vol. XXI. pp. 421 seq. Cf. also Franc. Lenormant, *Études sur l’alphabet Pehlvi*, *Journal Asiatique*, 1865, vol. II. pp. 180 seq.

² Levy, *ibid.*, p. 438.

³ Levy, *ibid.*, p. 428.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 445.

mined until solved by further research. Another group of coins has a bearing on the history of Irānian writing. The more modern ones are like those described above ; yet they must be placed before the beginning of the Sassanian dynasty. These coins are divided into two classes. The greater number of those included in the first class must be assigned on numismatic principles to the time of Phraates I. and Mithridates I., while some of the remaining ones may perhaps belong to the reign of Phraates IV.¹ To these coins M. Levy traces the so-called Parthian writing, which he is inclined to call Western Pahlavi. It is found on the monuments ascribed to the first Sassanidae, but not on their coins ; and after their time it becomes quite extinct. The coins comprised in the other class must, according to M. Levy,² be ascribed to the time of Vologeses II. (130-149 A.D.). The alphabets on the coins of both these classes are now regarded as the forerunner of the species of writing current under the first of the Sassanidae. It follows, then, that the latter cannot have been developed from the former, but that both must have sprung at the same time from the Aramaic alphabet, which ought to be considered as their common parent, and which is found on weights, seals, and gems belonging to the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Achaemenian monarchies. From the same alphabet first arose what has been styled the Southern Pahlavi writing, which M. Levy would call Eastern Pahlavi ;³ while the alphabet, which is known as the Parthian or Persian Pahlavi, must be distinguished as Western Pahlavi, which dies out after the inscriptions of the first two Sassanidae. Eastern Pahlavi, on the contrary, remained in use and developed gradually into the form in which we find it on the later Sassanian coins and in the Parsi manuscripts. We quite agree with this view of the development of the history of Irānian writing ; only we admit that we cannot exactly account for the names Eastern and Western Pahlavi. Although I concede that this species of writing may have been current already at a very remote period in Eastern Irān, where the oldest Indian character (the so-called Arian, the use of which for an Irānian language cannot be proved), may have existed with it, and that the Eastern Irānians may have possibly employed it whenever they wrote anything, still we must hold to our supposition that there are no facts before us to show that this alphabet was first introduced precisely into Eastern Irān, and thence gradually extended to the West. According to our opinion, we can here, again, distinguish between North and South. The so-called Western Pahlavi was chiefly current in the North, in the territory belonging to the Parthians. It died out after the fall of the Arsacidae, since, as the power of the Sassanidae grew in the South, the style of writing there current prevailed. The most important point here is that no essential difference ever existed between these two alphabets, and that both of them owed their origin unquestionably to

¹ *Vide* tablet II. Nos. 1—10 in Levy who places the coins numbered 8 and 9 in the time of Phraates IV.

² *Ibid.*, p. 455.

³ Levy, p. 456.

Western Semitic. Hence it is that vowels are imperfectly distinguished in all such alphabets, since they contain only three vowel-signs, viz. those for *a*, *i*, and *u*. Such a deficiency must have been very inconvenient in an Indo-Germanic language, as all the vowels could not have been accurately indicated by those three signs as in the Semitic languages. So the alphabet became in course of time more and more developed, as, from the time of Kobad I., writers began to employ an increasing number of new combinations consisting of two or more consonants linked together. I do not entirely dissent from the opinion expressed by Prof. Westergaard,¹ that among these compound consonants are also found some arbitrary characters; but I believe that their origin may be regarded as on the whole regular and natural. It was a current style, which, though hastily written, was not disagreeable to the eye; and to the natives, who understood the language, its difficulties may not have been so hard to surmount as they appear to us.²

According to our view, M. Levy is on the right path when he traces the so-called Zend alphabet, that in which the Avesta is written in our oldest MSS., to the Southern Irānian writing (Eastern Pahlavi).³ Several of the characters of both these alphabets are quite similar; but there is a number of signs peculiar to the Avesta alphabet, viz., those of the aspirates, which cannot easily be proved to have been developed from the Southern Irānian writing. The distinctive feature of the Avesta alphabet is in the vowel-signs. It not only comprises the *matres lectionis*, (i.e., the vowel-signs for *a*, *i*, *u*); but all the vowels, even the shortest ones, are represented in it and set down in the same line with the consonants, just as is the case in our European alphabets. This peculiarity distinguishes the Avesta alphabet from all the other alphabets of Irān and of Asia in general. For, not only is this characteristic absent in the Old Parthian and Sassānian systems, but, likewise, in the cuneiform as well as Arian characters, since the former only represents the *matres lectionis*, whilst the latter does not place the vowels on the same footing with the consonants, but merges them in the consonants themselves. A single Asiatic alphabet, the Armenian alone, possesses such characteristics. According to our conviction the Avesta alphabet does not seem to be older than the Armenian; perhaps, to a certain extent, it may be contemporaneous with it.....

¹ *Zendavesta*, vol. I. p. 20.

² The variety of writing which we have here designated as Southern Irānian, is also called *Uzvarsh* or *Huzvāresh*. A much quoted passage of a Parsi book. (*Cf. my Huzv. gramm.* page 22) expressly names *Uzvarsh* as an alphabet, and, indeed, as the writing of Sevād. This statement can easily be reconciled with the arguments adduced above.

³ *Cf. his Beiträge*, p. 480. A different view, however, is held by Lepsius, who, in the second edition of his *Standard-alphabets*, p. 120, is inclined to regard the Avesta alphabet as older, from which, he supposes, the ordinary Pahlavi alphabet was first reduced in the time of the Sassanidae.

In systematizing the Avesta alphabet the object which the people endeavoured to obtain could only have been to enable the reader to peruse the Sacred Texts as accurately as was necessary. It is probable that it was specially intended for particular individuals who had to read the Sacred Books to the people and who might be liable to commit slight errors in haste owing to the defects of the writing in use ; but it is less probable that the object in view was to help the general reader by means of a clear or lucid alphabet. I believe, therefore, that the inventor of the Avesta characters chiefly studied the requirements of the public readers of the Irānian Scriptures, for much, in fact, depended on accuracy in reading them aloud (Comp. *Yasna*, XIX. 6). We should, however, err, if we assumed that such was the exclusive object of the Avesta alphabet ; nothing indicates that it was ever regarded as sacred. Firstly, we find that the majority of the Parsis do not strictly believe that the Avesta was originally written in the Avesta characters that we now possess ; in fact, they have sometimes employed the modern Persian alphabet, and in modern times all the fragments of the Avesta, but most frequently the Khorda-Avesta, have been printed in Gujerati. Secondly, the Avesta-writing has not seldom been found also in Pahlavi works in the rendering of certain isolated words, mostly such as could not be made out by any other means. Just in the same manner do we find the Avesta characters frequently used in Pahlavi glossaries to show the pronunciation of certain Pahlavi expressions. Thirdly and finally, we may add that the Avesta alphabet probably contains more signs than are required to exhibit the Avesta Text. The writing in the oldest MSS. of the Avesta, as well as in the later Indian MSS. copied from them, differs somewhat from the characters used in the MSS. that were transcribed in Yezd and Kermān.¹ This difference is, however, unimportant, and, except in minor points, is perhaps due to a taste for elegant penmanship.

So far we have traced the history of Irānian writing from the earliest times to the more recent period, by the help of coins, inscriptions, and written works that are still in existence. Moreover, there are some notices upon Old Irānian alphabets by some Mohammedan scholars, who have written on the antiquities of Irān. Amongst these writers the learned author of the *Fihrist* occupies a pre-eminent position. The majority of these notices refer evidently to the modern Sassānian period and furnish no incomplete survey of the alphabets then current. It must not be supposed that the various specimens of writing, which they describe, represent quite as many systems ; several of them may be supposed to be distinct merely in the apparent shape of the characters, just in the same manner as in the later styles Taaliq and Shikest may be distinguished. Nevertheless, we ought to assume a variety of systems in a few cases, where a great difference exists in the number of letters. It is

¹ These will be found in my *Albaktrischen Grammatik*, pp. 7-8. The slight difference in them seems also to contravene the theory that our oldest MSS. came from Yezd.

certainly not accidental that the author of the *Fihrist* fixes upon seven as the number of alphabets ; the Parsis also believe that *Tahmurath* was gifted with the knowledge of seven descriptions of writing,¹ which was after him transferred to Yima. Elsewhere, too, the number seven is regarded as the most sacred amongst the Irānians.—First of all is to be mentioned the alphabet of Māni, which is probably one of the oldest in the series of alphabets named in *Fihrist*. Since there are several evidences to prove that Māni systematized a particular alphabet, this fact must be considered as beyond all doubt. It is probable that Māni did not wish that his books should be accessible to unqualified readers, and consequently wrote them in an alphabet which was only known to his disciples. This alphabet must have been distinguished from other Irānian alphabets more by the shape of the characters than by its intrinsic nature. As to the number of letters, our authorities are, however, disagreed. While Epiphanes affirms that the alphabet of Māni contained 22 symbols,² after the manner of the Syriac alphabet, the author of the *Fihrist* asserts that it was made up of a larger number of characters than the Arabic alphabet, *i.e.*, of more than 28 signs. One single specimen of that writing would be sufficient to remove all doubts.—A second important alphabet is that which is called by the author of the *Fihrist*, the *Din-defterih* (دين دفتره), which, as his name also denotes, served for writing the Avesta. Masūdi, who tells us somewhat more on the subject, mentions that this alphabet had 60 letters and was not employed exclusively for the Avesta.³ It might be regarded to a certain extent as identical with our Avesta alphabet, which exhibits only 48 different signs, granting the assumption that several characters, which were originally in existence, are now no longer distinguished in our Texts.⁴ Or we may attach some credit to Masūdi's opinion that this alphabet not only served for transcribing the Avesta ; but that the remaining 12 letters were employed in writing other works, which were beyond the pale of the Avesta literature.—A third species of writing, which the author of the *Fihrist* names *Kashtaj* (کشتج) is believed to have been composed of 28 signs and adapted to seals and coins. It was, perhaps, almost identical with the earlier writing of the Sassanidae, which contains only 24 signs including the ordinary compounds,⁵ and of which it is quite possible that some of the characters may still be unknown to us.—The fourth species is styled *Half-Kashtaj* (نیم کشتج) in the *Fihrist*, and was employed in works on medicine and philosophy. This alphabet differs but slightly from the third. Here the number of signs is the same ; probably the difference was due only to the materials

¹ Cf. my *Parsi-grammatik*, p. 130.

² Epiphanes, *Adv. Haeres.* II. p. 629, ed. Patav.

³ Cf. Lepsius, *Das ursprüngliche Zendalphabet* (Berlin, 1863), p. 338. Masūdi, II. p. 124. The *Fihrist*, I. 13th ed. Flugel.

⁴ This view of Lepsius is, no doubt, supported by the Parsi traditional writings.

⁵ Cf. Mordtmann, *Zdäm G.* vol. VIII. tablet 5.

used in writing books.—Much more unlike the third is the fifth kind of writing, which the *Fihrist* designates *Vesh-debirih* (ويش دبيره) i.e., “much-writing,” since it contained no less than 365 signs, in which, the author says, the mysteries of physiognomy were written. As it was a cryptography we must of course believe in the existence of a great multitude of characters, even if we do not regard the number 365 as authentic. What the shape of these letters was we should like to know; however, the brevity of the author’s statement does not admit of any conclusion. It is possible that the author of the *Fihrist* meant such contractions as are to be found in the Huzvaresh writing described above; but it is also possible that the style of writing in syllables, akin to the more complicated species of cuneal letters, survived from the earliest times to the period of the Sassanidae.—A far simpler alphabet is the sixth *Rāz-sahrih* (?) (رازسهره), i.e., cryptography. It was a twofold species comprising 25 as well as 40 signs, about which we can say very little in particular, because in all probability Ibn Muqaffa himself never saw it. The same may be said regarding the style of writing which he calls *Shāh-debirih* (شاه دبيره), or “royal writing,” and which must have been very much like the foregoing.—Finally, the seventh and last species bears the appellation of *Nāmeḥ-debirih* (نامه دبيره), i.e., the “writing of letters or books.” Besides, it is also stated that some books were written in the old Syriac language and read in Persian. This is somewhat analogous to what the same author says regarding *Zevāreshn*. Nevertheless, this alphabet is said to have been formed of only 33 simple characters without any contractions whatever.

THE ALLEGED PRACTICE OF CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES IN ANCIENT IRÂN.¹

INTRODUCTION.

IN the history of primitive marriage there are few subjects which exceed in gravity and interest the much-discussed question of the existence of consanguineous marriages in ancient Irân—in other words, of marriages between blood-relations of a near or remote degree among the early Zoroastrians. Although the attention of Parsi students of Zoroastrianism has often been drawn to this delicate question by the labours of esteemed European Oriental scholars, still it is strange to find how few of us have endeavoured to throw any light upon it, merely contenting ourselves with a bare denial of the existence of any trace of such marriage practices in our Sacred Writings. The causes of this remarkable omission may be easily traced to the manifold difficulties attending an examination of the evidence on the subject, which is met with in Western classical history and in Irânian archives. These difficulties are attributable partly to want of acquaintance with the languages of the original works ; partly to the obscurities of those Avesta and Pahlavi passages which are supposed by foreigners to refer to marriages between nearest kinsfolk ; and partly to the discouragement arising from the way in which some of the best European authorities have acquiesced in accepting the accounts given by Greek historians.

GENERAL REMARKS.

In all the inquiries which have long engaged the attention of European Orientalists, their efforts have been directed almost exclusively to verifying the testimony of classical reports to the effect that marriage between the nearest blood-relations was not an uncommon practice among the ancient Irânians in the times of the Achæmenidæ, the Arsacidæ, and the Sāsānidæ. Nay, it has even come to pass that several European *savants* have claimed to have discovered positive evidence of such marriages in the Sacred Writings and in the later Pahlavi works of the Irânians themselves. Guided solely by their opinions,² the Rev. J. van den Gheyn, S.J., in his well-known French Essay on “Comparative Mythology and Philology,” has been led to remark with reference to the moral tenets of the Avestā³ :—

¹ Papers read by me before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

² Particularly the opinion of my learned friend, the Rev. Dr. L. C. Casartelli, Professor of History and Geography, St. Bede's College, Manchester. See his *La Philosophie religieuse du Mazdéisme sous les Sassanides*, s. v. *Khvêtūkdas*.

³ Comp. *Essais de Mythologie et de Philologie Comparée*, per J. van den Gheyn, S.J. VII.—*Etudes Irâniennes*, II, *Les Etudes Avestiques de M. Geldner*, § 4, *Morale*, pp. 231-234 :—

"If the Mazdian writers delighted in psychological analyses, they were still more fond of discussions relating to morals. The Mazdian religion can boast of having the soundest, the sublimest, and the most rational system of morals among all the non-Christian religions. The basis of these morals rests on the free volition of man

"But side by side with these doctrines, so perfect and so rational, one may well be astonished to see that Mazdism approved of a doctrine which strangely contrasts with our ideas of morality. We mean to refer to the well-known *khvētukdas*, exalted as one of the most meritorious and sacred acts. This term, however, designates the incestuous marriage between near relations, even between father and daughter, son and mother, brother and sister. What could be more repulsive? How could a religion of so sublime a nature as Mazdism have inculcated such a practice? That is an historical question relating to the Avestā. We ought, therefore, to put it aside.

"The modern Parsis, it is true, have not preserved such immoral customs. They even protest with energy against the accusation of having ever taught any such doctrine. Unfortunately, they cannot burn their ancient books, the unimpeachable testimony borne against them."

Such is the observation of the Rev. Mr. Gheyn. It is not, however, the outcome of personal investigations in the field of Irānian literature, but is almost exclusively founded on the latest sources of Oriental knowledge in the series of the "Sacred Books of the East" planned by Prof. Max Müller. But far more important observations on the subject, which claim our earnest attention, have been put forth by some of those European *literati* who have delved deep in the mines of Oriental learning, and brought to light some of the most precious gems which will ever remain as monuments marking an important epoch in the history of Oriental literature. I beg to draw attention to the opinion of Dr. F. von Spiegel, a veteran Avesta scholar, which I have translated from the 3rd Vol. of his German work on "Irānian Antiquities"

"Si les écrivains mazdéens aimaient les distinctions psychologiques, ils étaient bien plus épris des discussions de morale. La religion mazdéenne peut, se vanter d'avoir, parmi tous les cultes non-chrétiens, la morale la plus saine la plus haute et la plus raisonnable. Les bases de la morale s'appuient sur la libre volonté de l'homme

"Mais à côté de ces doctrines si saines et si raisonnables, on peut s'étonner de voir approuver une doctrine qui contraste étrangement avec nos idées de moralité. Nous voulons parler du fameux Khvētūk-das, exalté comme une des œuvres les plus méritoires et les plus saintes. Et cependant, ce terme désigne le mariage incestueux entre proches parents, voire même entre père et fille, fils et mère, frère et sœur! Quoi de plus rebutant? Comment une religion d'une nature si élevée que le mazdeïsme, a-t-elle pu inculquer une telle pratique? C'est là une question historique qui se rattache à l'Avesta. Nous devons donc la laisser de côté."

"Les Parsis modernes, on le comprend, n'ont pas gardé ces habitudes immorales. Même ils protestent énergiquement contre l'accusation d'avoir jamais enseigné pareille doctrine. Malheureusement, ils ne peuvent anéantir leurs anciens livres, implacables témoins qui déposent contre eux,"

(*Erānische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. III, pp. 678-679). He says :—" Much offence has always been caused in Europe by the marriages between near relations, namely, between brothers and sisters, between fathers and daughters, between sons and mothers. They have their origin in the tribal relationship amongst the Irānians. They married in their own tribe, since no *mēsalliance* could be contracted, and everybody regarded his own tribe and his own family as the most preferable one. So early as in the Avesta the marriage of near relations is recommended (*Yasna*, XIII., 28; *Visparad*, III., 8); and it is also to the present day a custom among the nomads, whose daughter's very often decline the most favourable offers of marriage out of their family circle, because they think that such marriages might convey them into a town, and likewise into a different tribe. The extreme case of such marriages between relations is the marriage of brothers and sisters. According to Herodotus, Cambyzes first introduced the custom of marriage between brothers and sisters; but this is probably an error. The custom certainly existed already before him. That the kings were accustomed to take in marriage only the spouses of their rank from the family of the Achæmenidæ is witnessed in two passages by Herodotus. For this reason the marriages between brothers and sisters were much in favour with the royal family. Cambyzes married his sisters (Her. III, 31); Artaxerxes, his two daughters (Plutarch, Art. C. 27); Terituchmes, his sister Roxana (Ktes. Pers. C. 54); the satrap Sysimithres, even his mother (Curtius 8, 2, 19); Qōbād I., his daughter Sambyke. Agathias tells us that this custom also continued to later times."¹

Such, gentlemen, is the position of the European view fortified by fragmentary references to ancient history, and frowning against the most glorious edifice of the old Irānian ethology universally acknowledged to be the sublimest among the oldest religions of the world. This position it is the solemn duty of every Zoroastrian student of Irānian antiquities to inspect with the light of evidence furnished abundantly by history, both Occidental as well as Oriental. It is as undesirable as it is unphilosophic to dwell with idle complacency on the high praise which European scholars have almost invariably bestowed on Zoroastrianism for its sublime ethical conceptions, and to ignore allegations as to the practices in question of the early followers of Zoroaster. One of the true criteria of the morality of a nation is its marriage institution.

¹ Compare Dr. Wm. Geiger, *Ostirānische Kultur*, p. 246 :—" Auch den West-irāniern war die Heirat von Blutsverwandten nicht fremd. Schon die klassischen Autoren wissen davon zu berichten. Herodot ist der irrigen Ansicht, dass Kambyzes sie eingeführt habe, als er seine Schwester Atossa zum Weibe nahm. Gerade in der königlichen Familie kam sie häufig vor. Man hatte hier besonderes Interesse daran, den Stammbaum rein zu bewahren und das eigene Geschlecht möglichst von anderen Familien zu separieren. Aussor Kambyzes wäre Artaxerxes anzuführen, der seine beiden Töchter heiratete, sowie Terituchmes, der mit seiner Schwester Roxane, und Kōbād I., der mit seiner Schwester Sambyke sich vermählte."—Also cf. Windischmann, *Zoroastriische Studien*, p. 268, and L'Muséon (1885), *Les Noms Propres Perso-Avestiques*, par Th. Keiper, pp. 212 seq.

The moral life of society begins and is nurtured in the family. It is, therefore, scarcely possible to conceive how a nation, much less a religion, which has been generally extolled for its pure system of morals, and proverbial for its strictly moral habits, should have sanctioned or tolerated a custom which must naturally have demoralized the highly valued precept of "*pious mind, pious words, pious actions.*"¹

But, here, I may be allowed to observe that the Greeks who charged the Persians with the crime of consanguineous marriages, and who were distinguished among the Western nations before the Christian era for the high stage of civilization they had reached, were not unfamiliar with incestuous enormities. (1) In the *Prefatio* of Cornelius Nepos, the contemporary of Cicero, it is said that "Cimon, the greatest of the Athenians, was not dishonoured for having espoused his sister on the father's side." (2) The celebrated comic poet Aristophanes, who flourished in the 5th century B. C., relates in verse 1371 of his comedy of "The Frogs" :—"He began reciting some of the verses from Euripides, where one perceives a brother miserable, having married his uterine sister." (3) Demosthenes in his Appeal against Eubulides of Miletus, asserts : "My grand-father had espoused his sister not uterine."² According to the *Scholiast* the marriage with a half-sister was permitted by law among the ancient Greeks. The details which M'Lenan has gathered on this subject, go to prove that the old Spartans were also accustomed to marry even their uterine sisters. Again Mr. Robertson Smith remarks in his "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia" (p. 162) :—"At Athens we find marriage with a half-sister not uterine occurring in later times, and side by side with this we find an ancient tradition that before Cecrops there was a general practice of polyandry, and consequently kinship only through mothers." Mr. Wm. Adam points out that Xenophon's memoirs of Socrates refer to the intercourse of parents with children among the Greeks (*vide* his dissertation on "Consanguinity in Marriage," contributed to the *Fortnightly Review*, vol. II., p. 719).

These are some of the facts which plainly indicate that the custom of consanguineous marriages did actually exist in ancient Greece at a very remote period. These facts are preserved in its native archives, which it is

¹ Comp. my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," *supra*. pp. 218-219 :—"It affords indeed proof of a great ethical tendency and of a very sober and profound way of thinking, that the Avestā people, or at least the priests of their religion, arrived at the truth that sins by thought must be ranked with sins by deed, and that, therefore, the actual root and source of everything good or bad must be sought in the mind. It would not be easy to find a people that attained under equal or similar historical conditions to such a height of ethical knowledge."—Also cf. "Christ and Other Masters," by the Rev. Mr. Hardwick, p. 541 :—"In the measure of her moral sensibility, Persia may be fairly ranked among the brightest spots of ancient heathendom."

² For these references to Greek incest I am indebted to the kindness of the Honourable Sir Raymond West, President of the B. B. R. A. Society, and of M. James Darmesteter.

difficult to controvert. But, hence, it is allowable to infer that the Greek historians of ancient Irān were not unfamiliar with next-of-kin marriages, before they wrote a word upon any Oriental history or religion, and that their sweeping assertion of the incestuous practices of civilized Arians was to a certain extent due to their knowledge of the existence of such practices amongst Semitic nations¹ as well as amongst themselves.

In reference to the reports of Greek historians on Oriental customs, what assertion could be more sweeping and loose than that of Ptolemy, who (relying upon the authority of the *Paraphrasis* of Proclus, who flourished in the 5th century B.C.), when treating of India, Ariana, Gedrosia, Parthia, Media, Persia, Babylonia, Mesopotamia and Assyria, relates that "very many or most of the inhabitants of those countries intermarry with their own mothers" (*vide* Adam, F.R., "Consanguinity in Marriage," p. 713). But can this vague statement support so grave a charge? In the absence of something definite to go upon, some well attested instances, must we not pause before believing that the Indō-Irānians, even as individual peoples, could ever be guilty of the heinousness they are charged with?

With these preliminary remarks I address myself to my task, and lay before you what I purpose to demonstrate in the following propositions:—

I. That the slight authority of some isolated passages gleaned from the pages of Greek and Roman literature, is wholly insufficient to support the odious charge made against the ancient Irānians of practising consanguineous marriages in their most objectionable forms.

II. That no trace, hint or suggestion of such a custom can be pointed out in the Avesta or in its Pahlavi Version.

¹ In some of the sacred documents of the Jews, particularly in the Books of Genesis and Exodus, it is recorded that Abraham was married to his half-sister Sarai, Nahor to his niece Milcah, Amram to his aunt Jochebed, and Lot to his two daughters. The Book of Genesis xix. 36-38 says:—"Thus were both the daughters of Lot with child by their father; and the first-born bare a son, and called his name Moab; . . . and the younger, she also bare a son and called his name Benammi."—At a much later period, the granddaughter of King Herod the Great is said to have married her uncle Philip. Again, the Assyrians are charged by Lucian (*Lucian de Sacrificiis*, p. 183) with the guilt of close consanguineous marriages.—Also Orosius, a Spanish Presbyter who flourished in the 5th century after Christ, relates in his *Historiarum adversus Paganos Libri VII.*, that Semiramis, the widow of Ninus, married her own son, and authorized such marriages among her people in order to wipe out the stain of her own abominable action (*cf.* Adam, *Fortnightly Review*). The old Egyptians seem to have legalized the marriage between brothers and sisters (*vide* Rawlinson's *History of Herodotus*, Vol. II., p. 429, note 1); and, according to Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, there was no restriction even as to marrying one's whole sister (*Philo de Specialibus Legibus*, p. 778.)—The recently published work of Mr. Robertson Smith illustrated the existence of the practice of marriage between nearest blood-relations among the early Arabs.

But how far all these statements as regards those Oriental nations may be reliable, I leave it to the students of their histories and religions to prove with positive evidence.

III. That the Pahlavi passages translated by a distinguished English Pahlavi savant, and supposed to have references to such a custom, cannot be interpreted as upholding the view that next-of-kin marriages were expressly recommended therein. That a few of the Pahlavi passages, which are alleged to contain actual references to such marriages, do not allude to social realities but to supernatural conceptions relating to the reaction of the first progenitors of mankind.

IV. That the words of our Prophet Zarathustra himself, which are preserved in one of the strophes of the Gāthīc hymn LIII, express a highly moral ideal of the marriage relation.¹

I. CLASSICAL TESTIMONY ON THE SUBJECT.

Without presuming to attack any particular European theory, I beg to put forward my humble impressions in confirmation of the first statement. Among the Western classical writers, who are concerned with Persian history or religion, there are about fifteen who have touched upon the subject of next-of-kin marriages in ancient Irān, and who belong to different periods, from the 7th century B. C. to the 6th century A. D. They are Xanthus (fl. about B. C. 650) ; Herodotus (B. C. 484-409) ; Ctesias (fl. about B. C. 440) ; Strabo (B. C. 54 to A. D. 24) ; Plutarch (b. A.D. 66) ; Curtius (b. A. D. 70) ; Tertullian (A. D. 160-240) ; Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Diogenes Laertius, and Tatian (who flourished in the 2nd century A. D.) ; Minutius Felix, and Athenæus (fl. in the 3rd century A. D.) ; and Agathias (about A. D. 536-538). Of these Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Diogenes Laertius, Athenæus, Curtius, and Minutius Felix ascribe incestuous marriages to the Persians generally, according to Mr. Adam, "without any distinction or qualification." The spurious works of Xanthus as well as the genuine books of Strabo and Tatian, impute such practices to the Magians alone, without drawing any line of separation between the different Magian orders among the Chaldæans or the Persians. Herodotus, Ctesias, Plutarch, and Agathias make special mention of names of persons of rank, whom they charge with the guilt of such incest. Now, if we were to inquire to what different sources these reports owe their origin, we should find that Tertullian, Clemens Ale-

¹ Here let me draw attention to the opinion of Dr. L. H. Mills on the contents of the Gāthās. In S. B. E.; Vol. XXXI., p. 1, the translator observes :—

"So far as a claim to a high position among the curiosities of ancient moral lore is concerned, the reader may trust himself freely to the impression that he has before him an anthology which was probably composed with as fervent a desire to benefit the spiritual and moral nature of those to whom it was addressed as any which the world has yet seen. Nay, he may provisionally accept the opinion that nowhere else are such traces of intelligent religious earnestness to be found as existing at the period of the Gāthās or before them, save in the Semitic Scriptures." Elsewhere he also remarks : "Nowhere at their period, had there been a human voice, so far as we have any evidence, which uttered thoughts like these. They are now, some of them, the great common places of philosophical religion ; but till then they were unheard (*agusthā*)."

xandrinus, and his pupil Origen, as well as the true Plutarch, based their statements with regard to this question on the authority of Ctesias (Adam, F. R., p. 715); Rawlinson, Herodotus, Vol. 1, p. 78). Diogenes Laertius, Strabo, and Curtius seem to rely upon the spurious works of Xanthus (*vide* Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien*, p. 268 *seq.*; Adam, p. 717).¹ The works of Athenæus and Curtius are supposed to be collections of extracts from the writings of historians, dramatists, and philosophers, who preceded them (comp. Smith's "Classical Dictionary," s. v.). In the absence of any available information, it is difficult to trace the isolated reports of Tatian and Minutius Felix to Xanthus, Ctesias, or Herodotus. Consequently, the only independent sources of information more or less authentic, seem to issue from only four of the classical writers above-named:—Xanthus, Herodotus, Ctesias, and Agathias. Their reports may be considered to have modelled the tone of classical history relating to ancient Irān.

However, in an enquiry with regard to their evidence, the questions most important and most natural are: What is their authenticity? How far may their testimony be relied upon? Are there any conflicting statements in these historians which should deter us from trusting implicitly to their guidance?

It is admitted that no two nations have ever succeeded in thoroughly understanding the manners and customs of each other. If this is so in our own day, when the means of information are numerous and ready to hand, what can we expect in those remote ages when the sources of information were very few and very uncertain. Again, it is necessary to be on our guard against putting absolute faith in any particular Greek writer.—Regarding Xanthus, Windischmann, in his German essay on the classical testimony relating to Zoroaster, published in his posthumous work *Zoroastrische Studien*, states (p. 268)¹:—"As to the authenticity of the works of Xanthus (B. C. 529), a later writer, Artemon of Cassandra, advanced some doubts, and believed that they were (substituted five centuries after) by Dionysius Skyto-brachion" (a native of Alexandria, who flourished about B. C. 120). This view is supported, as the writer says, by his tutor, F. G. Welcker. Also it is the opinion of Dr. Smith, expressed in his "Classical Dictionary" that "The genuineness of the Four Books of Lydian History, which the ancients possessed under the name of Xanthus, and of which some considerable fragments have come down to us, was questioned by some of the ancient grammarians themselves. There has been considerable controversy respecting the genuineness of this work among modern scholars. It is certain that much of the matter in the extant fragments is spurious."

"The Persian informants of Herodotus," says Mr. G. Rawlinson in his Introduction to the "History of Herodotus" (pp. 67, 69), "seem to have

¹ Comp. my English version, pp. 76 *seq.* in this volume.

consisted of the soldiers and officials of various ranks,¹ with whom he necessarily came in contact at Sardis and other places, where strong bodies of the dominant people were maintained constantly. He was born and bred up a Persian subject; and though in his own city Persians might be rare visitants, everywhere beyond the limits of the Grecian states they formed the official class, and in the great towns they were even a considerable section of the population. There is no reason to believe that *Herodotus ever set foot in Persia Proper, or was in a country where the Arian element preponderated*. Hence his mistakes with regard to the Persian religion which he confounded with the Scythic worship of Susiania, Armenia, and Cappadocia. . . . Herodotus, too, was, by natural temperament, inclined to look with favour on the poetical and the marvellous, and where he had to choose between a number of conflicting stories would be disposed to reject the prosaic and commonplace for the romantic and extraordinary. . . . Thus his narrative, where it can be compared with the Persian monumental records, presents the curious contrast of minute and exact agreement in some parts with broad and striking diversity in others. Unfortunately, a direct comparison of this kind can but rarely be made, owing to the scantiness of the Persian records at present discovered; but we are justified in assuming, from the coincidences actually observable, that at least some of his authorities drew their histories from the monuments; and it even seems as if Herodotus had himself had access to certain of the most important of those documents which were preserved in the archives of the empire."

Whatever might be the opinion of Mr. Rawlinson, one thing is clear on its face, that the truthfulness of the Persian informants upon whom Herodotus had depended was not quite beyond suspicion, *viz.*, the utter silence of Herodotus upon the founder of the Persian religion. While Xanthus is believed to have made mention of Zoroaster and his laws, while Plato, who flourished 55 years after Herodotus and must have drawn his materials consequently from sources as old as those of the latter, freely alludes to Zoroaster, it is impossible to conceive how Herodotus, who has described Persian life and Persian religion so elaborately, should have been unfamiliar with the name of the prophet of the land and the founder of the religion. Should we not assume that Herodotus became acquainted with the Magian belief merely through oral tradition recounted by persons who were ill-disposed towards the Magi, and who, therefore, were loth to divulge the name of their renowned Prophet?

Mr. George Rawlinson remarks further on (p. 77 *seq.*) :—"Several ancient writers, among them two of considerable repute, Ctesias, the court physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, and Plutarch, or rather an author who has made free with his name, have impeached the truthfulness of the historian Herodotus,

¹ These and several other words in the following quotations are put in italics by me.

and maintained that his narrative is entitled to little credit. Ctesias seems to have introduced his own work to the favourable notice of his countrymen by a formal attack on the veracity of his great predecessor, upon the ruins of whose reputation he hoped to establish his own. He designed his history to supersede that of Herodotus, and feeling it in vain to endeavour to cope with him in the charms of composition, he set himself to invalidate his authority, presuming upon his own claims to attention as a resident for seventeen years at the court of the great king. Professing to draw his relation of Oriental affairs from a laborious examination of the Persian archives, he proceeded to contradict, wherever he could do so without fear of detection, the assertions of his rival; and he thus acquired to himself a degree of fame and of consideration to which his literary merits would certainly never have entitled him, and which the course of detraction he pursued could alone have enabled him to gain. By the most unblushing effrontery he succeeded in palming off his narrative upon the ancient world as the true and genuine account of the transactions, and his authority was commonly followed in preference to that of Herodotus, at least upon all points of purely Oriental history."

Now regarding Ctesias, the same writer observes:—"There were not wanting indeed in ancient time some more critical spirits, *c. g.*, Aristotle and the true Plutarch, who refused to accept as indisputable the statements of the Cnidian physician, and retorted upon him the charge of untruthfulness which he had preferred against Herodotus. It was difficult, however, to convict Ctesias of systematic falsehood until Oriental materials of an authentic character were obtained by which to test the conflicting accounts of the two writers. A comparison with the Jewish Scriptures and with the native history of Berosus first raised a general suspicion of the bad faith of Ctesias, whose credit few moderns have been bold enough to maintain against the continually increasing evidence against him. At last the *coup de grâce* has been given to his small remaining reputation by the recent Cuneiform discoveries which convict him of having striven to rise into notice by a system of 'enormous lying,' to which the history of literature scarcely presents a parallel."

Hence it is that the historian Grote is perfectly justified in remarking:—"This is a proof of the prevalence of discordant, yet equally accredited stories. So rare and late a plant is historical authenticity."

As for Agathias, the Byzantine writer who flourished in the middle of the sixth century after Christ, his works ought to be consulted with greater caution. Besides, Diogenes Laertius is very often called "an inaccurate and unphilosophical writer." Even the true Plutarch's testimony is frequently questioned by modern critics. The reference to consanguineous marriages amongst the Magi: *τοῦτοις δὲ καὶ μητρὰ συνερχομένη πατρίων νενομιστάς*; in Strabo's Geography, Bk. XV, is a very short and isolated sentence, which

has not the least connection with the main subject of the passage wherein it occurs, *viz.*, the mode of disposing of the dead among the early Persians.¹ It might, therefore, be justly regarded as an interpolation by some unknown reader, similar to the interpolations noticed in the work of Xenophon, Bk. VIII, Ch. V, p. 26, and condemned as such by all his critics of authority, *viz.*, Bornemann, Schneider, and Dindorf.

It must also be remembered that the works of some of those Greek philosophers who were well-known for their somewhat authentic description of the Zoroastrian religion and customs, *viz.*, Democritus (fl. about B. C. 460), Deinon the contemporary of Ctesias, Plato, Eudoxus, Hermippos, Theopompos, and Aristotle, do not contain the slightest trace or hint as to the alleged practice of next-of-kin marriages in ancient Irān.

Thus a majority of opinions may be cited to prove that the reports of classical writers on the subject of consanguineous marriages in old Irān are not at all beyond question. Moreover, I do not mean to deny that some of those Greek writers who have ascribed the marriage practices in question in the case of individuals to the old Irānians, may have had some grounds for their averment. But who can reconcile their conflicting evidence? Who can decide between the two inconsistent statements upon this subject by Xanthus and Agathias, where the former charges the Magi with the crime of marrying their parents, while the latter puts into the mouth of King Artaxerxes II. words which plainly denounce such practices as being inconsistent not only with the laws of the land, but with the commandment of Zoroastrianism (*vide* Agathias Lib. II., C. 24). The Achæmenian monuments do not allude to such practices, nor have we any indigenous historical record of the Achæmenidæ or the Arsacidæ, upon which we could place any reliance for comparison. Alas! for the dispersion and destruction of our ancient literature, which, had it been preserved, would not only have assisted as to know the exact history of the old Irānian civilization; but also to controvert with ease all such discreditable allegations.

Nevertheless, the question arises:—Granted that the classical statements are to some extent doubtful; still are we not justified in believing that such marriages were customary or regarded as lawful during the rule of the Achæmenian kings, since the Greek reports refer to certain Persian monarchs or men of authority who contracted marriages with their nearest blood-relations?

It is true, Herodotus and Plutarch ascribe them to Cambyses III. and Artaxerxes II. Herodotus states in his accounts respecting Cambyses (*vide* Bk. III, 31 *seq.*):—"The second (outrage which Cambyses committed) was the slaying of his sister, who had accompanied him into Egypt, and lived

¹ *Géographie de Strabon* traduit du Grec en Français, tome cinquième à Paris, de l'Imprimerie Royale, 1819, pp. 140-141.

with him as his wife, though she was his full sister, the daughter both of his father and his mother. The way wherein he had made her his wife was the following :—It was not the custom of the Persians, before his time, to marry their sisters ; but Cambyzes, happening to fall in love with one of his, and wishing to take her to wife, as he knew that it was an *uncommon thing*, called together the royal judges, and put it to them, ‘ whether there was any law which allowed a brother, if he wished, to marry his sister ? ’ Now the royal judges are certain picked men among the Persians, who hold their office for life, or until they are found guilty of some misconduct. By them justice is administered in Persia and they are the interpreters of the old laws, all disputes being referred to their decision. When Cambyzes, therefore, put his question to these judges, they gave him an answer which was at once true and *safe* :— ‘ They did not find any law,’ they said, ‘ allowing a brother to take his sister to wife, but they found a law that the king of the Persians might do whatever he pleased.’ And so they neither warped the law through fear of Cambyzes, nor ruined themselves by overstiffly maintaining the law ; but they brought another quite distinct law to the king’s help, which allowed him to have his wish. Cambyzes, therefore, married the object of his love, and no longer time afterwards he took to wife another sister. It was the younger of these who went with him into Egypt, and there suffered death at his hands.” “ The story,” concerning the manner of her death, “ which the Greeks tell, is, that Cambyzes had set a young dog to fight the cub of a lioness—his wife looking on at the time. Now the dog was getting the worse, when a pup of the same litter broke his chain and came to his brother’s aid ; then the two dogs together fought the lion, and conquered him. The thing greatly pleased Cambyzes, but his sister, who was sitting by, shed tears. When Cambyzes saw this he asked her why she wept : whereon she told him that seeing the young dog come to his brother’s aid made her think of Smerdis (her brother), whom there was none to help. For this speech, the Greeks say, Cambyzes put her to death.”

But from these statements of the historian of Halicarnassus, is it not plain enough that the marriage of Cambyzes with his sister—if we may rely upon the Greek evidence alone—was nothing more than the individual act of one of the most wicked tyrants that ever reigned in Persia, and that it was owing to the cruel and ferocious character of their ruler that this most irreligious marriage from the stand-point of the Magi was acquiesced in by the priests as well as the people ? And is this action of a vicious and wicked king sufficient to justify us in affixing the stigma of such a custom to the whole Irānian nation, or in tracing it to their religious writings ? Further, it should be remembered that Cambyzes utterly disregarded his priesthood, defied the old sanitary ordinances of his people, and set small store by his religion.² Her

² Compare S. B. E., Vol. IV., “The Zend-Avestā,” by James Darmesteter, Part I 1st edition, p. XLV. :—“If we pass now from dogma to practice, we find that the most

gave proof of this by attempting to encourage in his kingdom the practice of interring the dead amongst a people by whom it was detested. It is not, therefore, unreasonable to assume that the alleged marriage of Cambyzes with his sister was suggested by his familiarity with such marriages among the Egyptians and the Greeks conquered by the Persians, and that it was carried into effect by a man of such violent passions as would brook no contradiction, and would not be balked of their gratification.

Here I may be allowed to observe, in passing, that it is difficult to agree with those European scholars¹ who doubt the accuracy of the assertion of Herodotus, that Cambyzes was the first Persian to intermarry with his sister. I believe that their hypothesis, that the institution of such marriages had existed long before Cambyzes reigned, is much more open to question than the statement of the Greek historian; and this will be demonstrated further on when I come to prove my second statement.

There is another Achæmenian monarch who is alluded to by Plutarch, on the authority of Ctesias and his followers, as having married his sister. According to Langhorn's translation of Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes II*, the Greek biographer relates:—"Artaxerxes in some measure atoned for the causes of sorrow he gave the Greeks, by doing one thing that afforded them great pleasure; he put Tissaphernes, their most implacable enemy, to death. This he did, partly at the instigation of Parysatis, who added other charges to those alleged against him. . . . From this time Parysatis made it a rule to please the king in all her measures, and not to oppose any of his inclinations, by which she gained an absolute ascendance over him. She perceived that he had a strong passion for one of his own daughters named Atosea. He endeavoured, indeed, to conceal it on his mother's account and restrained it in public. Parysatis no sooner suspected the intrigue, than she caressed her grand-daughter more than ever, and was continually praising to

important practice of the Avesta law was either disregarded by the Achæmenian kings, or unknown to them. According to the Avesta, burying corpses in the earth is one of the most heinous sins that can be committed. We know that under the Sāsānians a prime minister, Ceoses, paid with his life for an infraction of that law. Corpses were to be laid down on the summits of mountains, there to be devoured by bird and dogs; the exposure of corpses was the most striking practice of Mazdian profession, and its adoption was the sign of conversion. Now under the Achæmenian rule, not only the burial of the dead was not forbidden, but it was the general practice."

¹ Cf. Keiper, *L'Muséon*, 1885, pp. 212-213:—"Hérodote tâchait d'expliquer le mieux possible cette habitude qu'il savait être de la plus haute antiquité, parce qu'elle semblait étrange aux Grecs. Il rattacha donc cette innovation prétendue au nom de Cambyse, parce qu'un fait de ce genre lui parut être, conforme au caractère despotique et capricieux de ce prince. Peut-être aussi a-t-il tiré cette information de ceux à qui il devait ses autres renseignements sur Cambyse. Nous reconnaissons ici un procédé pareil, à celui dont Xénophon use régulièrement dans la *Cyropédie*, quand il veut expliquer l'origine d'une habitude ou d'une institution des Perses qui était réellement ancienne ou qu'il croyait ancienne."—*Cf.* Spiegel's remarks which are herein quoted by me (p. 208).

Artaxerxes, both her beauty and her behaviour, in which she assured him there was something great and worthy of a crown. At last she persuaded him to make her his wife, without regarding the laws and opinions of the Greeks : ' God,' said she, ' has made you law to the Persians, and a rule of right and wrong.' "

Now, what do we gather from this passage ? Nothing more than that Artaxerxes regarded his passion for his daughter as being in every way hurtful to his reputation, in every way unacceptable to his people or unjustified by law, and, therefore, endeavoured to hide it from his mother as well as the public. Hence we may, likewise, infer that the statements of Herodotus as well as Plutarch harmonize with each other in showing that the marriage of an absolute monarch with a sister or a daughter was an act in which neither the Persian law nor people was acquiescent. If, according to a few scholars, it was a deed not unauthorized by the Avesta,—if it was a practice quite familiar to the Persian people of by-gone ages,—what earthly reasons could have persuaded Cambyses, the most passionate of monarchs, to ask for the decision of the judges on the question, or Artaxerxes to conceal his love for his daughter from the knowledge of his people ? Besides, we have the evidence of Agathias, that Artaxerxes contemptuously declined every offer to contract marriage with his nearest-of-kin relation, on the ground that it was quite inconsistent with the faith of a true Irânian. If we believe this, it is impossible to conceive that such a king could ever have taken his own daughter to wife. On the basis of this very evidence from Agathias, Mr. Wm. Adam observes (F. R., p. 718) :—“ But if this could be alleged by Artaxerxes belonging to the royal race, what becomes of the worst charges brought against, not only the Persian people, but even against the Magians or the ruling class ? ” 1

¹ The question regarding the alleged marriage of Atraxerxes Mnemon with his daughter, reminds me of a statement of Firdausi, in his well known Persian Epic, the *Shāh-nāmah*, that Behman (Pahl. *Vohūman*), son of Isfandyār (Av. *Spentō-dāta*, Pahl. *Spend-ddd*), who is also called the Artakshatar of the Kayānians—hence his identification with Artaxerxes Longimanus and his successors down to Artaxerxes Mnemon—was married to Hūmāi, his daughter. This is a statement which is unique in the *Shāh-nāmah*, nevertheless it is based, however erroneously, on a reference contained in the *Bundahishn*, Chap. XXXIV. 8, which admits of two different ideas on account of the occurrence therein of a word *yūkt* or *dūkt*, which is employed in Pahlavi in two different meanings. The Pahlavi passage upon which Firdusi must have relied runs—
 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭮𐭲
Hūmāi Vohūman yūkt 30 shant. Here the word *yūkt* may be read *dūkt* or *yūkt* and it may respectively mean (1) a daughter, (2) one who is coupled or joined in wedlock with another. Thus the passage may be rendered (1) Hūmāi the daughter of Vohuman, (reigned) thirty years. The latter rendering is the more correct interpretation, and also in harmony with the elaborate biography of Behman, written in the reign of Sultān Mahmud Malikshāh Saljūk (Hijra 537-551), and known as the *Bahman nāmah*, which relates that

Although Ctesias' books were generally acknowledged by his own countrymen to be teeming with incredible and extravagant fables and fictions—according to Plutarch, with great absurdities and palpable falsity—still we must admit that for the Greek writers who flourished after him no other historian would have been more reliable as regards the family life of Artaxerxes Mnemon than one who lived at the Court of Persia for seventeen years in the quality of physician to that king. Hence it is that most of the Greek historians who followed him, seem to generalize the practice of consanguineous marriage in ancient Irân, probably from Ctesias' coloured narrative of the alleged marriage of Artaxerxes with his daughter. Whatever may be the degree of truthfulness and honesty so far as Ctesias is concerned, it is not impossible to argue, from the character and intrigues of Parysatis, the mother of Artaxerxes, that a slanderous story of the nature described by Ctesias might have been set afloat in the king's harem to gratify the rancour and most wicked vengeance of the queen-mother against the children of Stastira, the innocent victim of her revenge for the murder of her own daughter Amistris, the wife of Terituchmes and sister of Artaxerxes. It is also not improbable that Ctesias' narrative of the marriage of Atossa with her father owed its origin to the vindictive Parysatis alone, and was adopted by a writer who preferred to relate astounding inventions instead of sober truths. Oriental history is not unfamiliar with the malignant accusations of the crime of incest by step-mothers or even by mothers-in-law against their daughters or daughters-in-law. It might, therefore, be inferred that if the Greek writer did not invent any fiction as to the domestic life of the Persian ruler, there was another and a more powerful cause which would have given rise to such an abominable story and established it as sober truth in the mind of the original biographer of Artaxerxes.

Besides this, a few European scholars seem to point to another such instance in the history of Artaxerxes Mnemon. They discover in Ctesias

the Hûmâi, whom Vôhûman married, was not his own daughter, but the daughter of an Egyptian king named نصرجارث Nasrjârs. The words of the poet run as follows:—

فرستاد برزین یل را بخواست	وزین در فراوان سخنها برآند
که پیری بنزدیک من یافت راه	همی پشت من کرد خوابد تپاہ
چنین روزگارم بپایان رسید	نیامد کسی از گهر من پدید
دل من چنان کرد بیکبارہ رای	که آرام گیرد جهان برہمای
چہ گوی سپارم بدو نکتہ گاہ	جز آن کی کند کسی تو بیند سپاہ

.....

.....

نگہدار تاج کبان برہمای	فراموش مکن بند آن رہ نمای
زمن بار دارد چو آید پدید	از او شہریاری نباید برید
اگر دختر آرد گر آرد پسر	بندم بر زمان بر سرش تاج زر
زمانہ سخن درد بانہش شگفت	بدندان آن از دہا کش بخت

that Terituchmes, the brother-in-law of the king, and husband of Amestris, was married to his sister Roxana. However, with all deference to their scholarship, I may be permitted to draw attention to the original words of the Greek writer, wherein, as far as I am able to comprehend, the notion of marriage is by no means involved. According to a passage occurring in the English translation of Plutarch's *Lives*, by Langhorne (III, p. 451), Ctesias relates :—"Terituchmes, the brother of Statira (the wife of king Artaxerxes II), who had been guilty of the complicated crimes of adultery, incest, and murder, . . . married Hamestris, one of the daughters of Darius, and sister to Arsaces ; by reason of which marriage he had interest enough, on his father's demise, to get himself appointed to his Government. But in the meantime he conceived a passion for his own sister Roxana, and resolved to despatch his wife Hamestris." It is said further on, that "Darius, being apprised of this design, engaged Udiates, an intimate friend of Terituchmes, to kill him, and was rewarded by the king with the government of his province." Such is the plain evidence of Ctesias ; but it does not assert that Terituchmes was ever married to Roxana. Here is evidently the case of a passion conceived by a licentious brother for his sister. It must, however, be remembered we have again to deal with a story of Ctesias, a story which may naturally be regarded as the outcome of a general hatred at court against Terituchmes, and also as the invention of a motive for his most cruel murder of his wife, the daughter of Parysatis—a queen who had contrived the most wicked means of gratifying her vengeance against her son-in-law and all other unfortunate victims who were suspected of abetting him. Whatever may be the source to which we may trace this story, it is still difficult to determine whether Terituchmes married again at all after having murdered his wife Amestris.

As regards Sysimithres, a single isolated reference in a writer like Curtius is hardly sufficient to claim our attention.

Next we turn to the name that belongs to the period of the Sāsānidæ, a single positive illustration, indeed, of incestuous marriage, according to the Greeks, during the long period of more than 450 years. That name is Kōbād I., father of the famous king Noshiravān. He is reported by Agathias to have married his daughter Sambyke. However, it is remarkable that neither Professor Rawlinson nor Firdūsi seem to notice this occurrence. Nevertheless, trusting implicitly to the account of Agathias, a writer who was contemporaneous with Kōbād's son, we must here consider the influences under which the king might have been persuaded to yield to such an act. Let us refer to the history of that part of his reign which described the imposture of Mazdak and the effect which the latter produced upon that weak-minded king by preaching his abominable creed. "All men," Mazdak said, "were by God's providence, born equal—none brought into the world any property, or any natural right to possess more than another. Property and marriage were mere human inventions, contrary to the will of God, which required an

equal division of the good things of this world among all, and forbade the appropriation of particular women by individual men. In communities based upon property and marriage, men might lawfully vindicate their natural rights by taking their fair share of the good things wrongfully appropriated by their fellows. Adultery, incest, theft, were not really crimes, but necessary steps towards re-establishing the laws of nature in such societies." (*Vide* Rawlinson, "The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy," pp. 342, *seq.*)

Such being the teaching of Mazdak, it is easy to see what attractions it would have for a licentious prince who would willingly substitute it for the moral restraints of his purer faith. Be this as it may, Kōbād's apostacy was followed by a civil commotion, which ended in the deposition of the king and his imprisonment in the "Castle of Oblivion." Now, does not this successful popular resistance to royal incest and adultery prove that the minds of the Iranians were averse to any violation of the moral law as to the relation between the sexes? There is one important point to be observed in the accounts of Agathias bearing on the doctrines which the Mazdakian heretics professed, *viz.*, his assertion that consanguineous marriages were enormities recently introduced in Irān. If we accept this remark of a contemporary writer, does it not give a death-blow to all preceding authorities? Hence Mr. Adam rightly asserts (*F. R.*, p. 716):—"But if 'those enormities were recent,' this contradicts all the preceding more ancient authorities, which affirm their earlier prevalence from Ctesias downwards."

Now discarding all the fanciful hypotheses indulged in by speculative thinkers upon early human ideas and practices, I shall make a few assumptions that naturally strike me, while examining the evidences above-mentioned. The first point to be remarked upon is that great care is required to avoid the confusion arising from the indiscriminate use of the words "sister," "daughter," "mother." Among some Oriental people the designation "sister" is not merely applied to a sister proper or daughter of one's own parents, but, as an affectionate term, also to cousins, near or distant, to sisters-in-law, to female friends, &c. Likewise, the word for daughter is used to denote not only one's own daughter but also the daughter of one's own brother or sister, and generally the daughter of a relative, &c. Similarly, the term "mother" does not signify the female parent alone, but it is employed as a respectful form of address to an elderly lady who enjoys the honour of being the mater-familias of a household. It is, likewise, necessary to observe that in Old-Persian or Pahlavi there are rarely any distinct expressions to distinguish sisters from sisters-in-law or female cousins. It is not, therefore, too strained an interpretation to believe that what Herodotus, Ctesias and others supposed to be sisters and daughters, should have been perhaps next-cousins or relations. In the same manner, it might be surmised that a mistake would be made owing to the same name being borne by several female members of a family. Thus the wife and a daughter, or the wife and a sister, or the wife

and the mother having the same name, what was asserted of one might be wrongly applied to the other. Innumerable instances may be found in Parsi families where the name of the mistress of the house coincides with that of one of her daughters-in-law, nieces, &c.

But, one can scarcely infer from the particular illustrations of classical testimony on the subject, which are met with in Herodotus, Ctesias, and Agathias, and are open to many objections, that incestuous marriages were common and legal among the old Irânians as a people, and especially among the Magi. The very statement of the Greeks, that the Achæmenian monarch was supposed to be above the law of the land and of religion, indicates that his adultery or incest was not in accordance with the established institutions of his realm. Nor did the people in the time of Kôbâd I. allow such incest to pass without vehement opposition. Even if we accept the evidence of the Western historians who charge Cambyzes, Artaxerxes, Mnemon, Kôbâd, and Terituchmes with incest, it must be noted that these few are the only instances they have been able to gather in the long period of upwards of a thousand years, and that they are insufficient to support so sweeping a generalization as that incestuous marriages were recognized by law, and commonly practised among the old Irânians. It is just as unreasonable as to ascribe the custom of marriage between brother and sister to the civilized Grecians, because we discover references to it in Cornelius Nepos, Demosthenes, and Aristophanes. If the *Mahâbhârata* tells us that the five Pandava princes who had received a strictly Brâhmanic education, were married to one wife, should we, therefore, ignore the existence of the Brâhmanic law,¹ which clearly lays down (Max Müller, "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature", p. 53; M'Lennan, p. 215) "they are many wives of one man, not many husbands, of one wife," and charge with the custom of polyandry all the ancient Brâhmanic Indians who constituted one of the most eminent and highly intellectual nations of the early Oriental world.

From what I have said above, it is not difficult to see that the doubtful evidences of the Greeks neutralize themselves, and that it is absurd to form, with any reliance upon them, a definite opinion as regards the marriage customs of the old Irânians. I, therefore, repeat my conviction which I have set forth in my first statement—*That the slight authority of some isolated passages gleaned from the pages of Greek and Roman literature, is wholly insufficient to support the odious charge made against the old Irânians of practising consanguineous marriages in their most objectionable forms!*

¹ Compare "Tagore Law Lectures" (1883), by Dr. J. Jolly, p. 155 :—"But I have been led recently to consider my views," remarks Dr. Jolly, "by the investigations of Professor Bühler, who has pointed out to me that a certain sort of Polyandry is referred to in two different Smritis. Apastamba (II. 10, 27, 2-4) speaks of the forbidden practice of delivering a bride to a whole family (*kula*). Brihaspati refers to the same custom in the same terms." Further on he says :—"The text of Apastamba refers to the custom as to an ancient one, which was enjoined by the early sages, but is now obsolete."

THE MEANING OF THE AVESTA WORD *Hvaētvadatha*.

II. In proof of the second statement—*That no trace, hint or suggestion of such a custom can be pointed out in the Avesta, or in its Pahlavi Version*—it is first of all necessary to enquire what is the opinion of the Avesta on the subject, whether we are able to trace to any Avestā precept the alleged custom of next-of-kin marriage in old Irān. According to European scholars, the term that expresses such a marriage is *𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀* *hvaētvadatha* or *khaētvadatha* in the Avesta, and *𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀* *khvētākrlāt* (originally *hvētākrlāt*) or *𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀* *khvētāk-dasīh* in Pahlavi. It has, therefore, been our object to examine the evidence put forward in favour of the European standpoint of *Yasna* XII, 9, (Spiegel's edition, *Ys.*, XIII, 28), which, it is assumed, contain under the word *hvaētvadatha* an allusion to next-of-kin marriages in question.

In the Avesta the term *hvaētvadatha* occurs in five passages only, each of which belongs to five different parts of the text, excepting the *Gāthās*, namely, *Yasna* XII, 9; *Visparad* III, 3; *Vendidād* VIII, 13; *Yasht* XXIV, 17; and *Gāh* IV, 8 (Westergaard's edition). Of these, the idea expressed in *Gāh* IV is repeated or almost quoted in *Visparad* III, 3, and in *Yasht* XXIV. So we have only to consider three references in the *Yasna*, the *Gāh* and the *Vendidād* respectively, and to see to what extent they can be used to throw light on the meaning of *hvaētvadatha*. The word, as it stands in the Avesta, is employed as an epithet or a qualifying word. In one place it forms an epithet of the Avesta religion, in the second an attribute of a pious youth, in the third a qualification for a pious male or female.

Etymologically *hvaētvadatha* may be regarded as a compound word composed of *hvaētu* and *datha*, of which the first part may be compared with Skr. *svayam*, Lat. *suus*, Pahlavi *khvīsh* and Mod. Pers. *kh'ish*, which are derived from Av. *hva*, Skr. *sva*, Lat. *sibi*, and Eng. *self*. Hence it may originally mean "self," "one's self," "one's own," "a relation" or "a kindred." The second part *datha*, which is equivalent to the Pahl. *das*, comes from the Av. root *dā* "to give," "to make," "to create;" *dath* being properly a reduplication peculiar to the Irānian dialect, from the Indō-Irānian root *dā* "to give," etc. Thus the derivation of the whole word itself might suggest for it a number of definitions. It may mean "a gift of one's self, or to one's self, or from one's self," "a gift of one's own, or to one's own," "a gift of relationship or alliance," "a making of one's self," or "self-association," "self-dedication," "self-devotion," "self-sacrifice," etc.¹ These are some of the signifi-

¹ Compare Prof. Darmesteter's remarks on the derivation of the word suggested by Dr. Geldner in his *Ueber des Metrik des jüngeren Avesta (Etudes Irāniennes, Vol. II., p. 37)*: —"Parfois les étymologies de l'auteur sont si ingénieuses qu'on est peiné d'être forcé de

cations which may be indicated on the ground of etymology ; however, it is hazardous to choose from them any particular notion without the authority of the native meaning. On applying to the Pahlavi translation of the Avesta to know the meaning attached to the word by early commentators, I am disappointed to find that it affords no more light than can be obtained from a mere Pahlavi transliteration, *khvetūk-dāt* or *khvetūk-dasih*, of the original Avesta expression *hvaētvadatha*. The reason for this striking omission of any definite interpretation in the Pahlavi version, may perhaps be that the technical meaning of the word was, even centuries after the compilation of the Avesta, a thing too familiar to the native Zoroastrians to require any interpretation ; or that the nature of the good work implied by *hvaētvadatha* was too doubtful in the minds of the old Irānian priests to be definitely and lucidly explained.

Consequently, very little help can be obtained from the indigenous authority of the Pahlavi translation of those Avestā passages wherein the term *hvaētvadatha* occurs. Fortunately, however, there is no lack of passages in Pahlavi, which, though sometimes very obscure and difficult, give us a meaning for the first member of the compound, viz., *hvaētu*, and which is *kh'ish* or *kh'ishih*, meaning "self," "himself," "one's own" or "kindred," "relation," "individuality," &c. The Pahlavi meaning of "self" or "relation" is still preserved in the Mod. Pers. word *kh'ish*, and accords best with the etymology and the context. Dr. F. Von Spiegel translates *hvaētu* by "*der Verwandte*" (*Yasna XXXII. 1, &c.*) "the allied or relation," and remarks in note 7, page 125, of his German translation of the Avesta, that it denotes "the spiritual relation to Ahura Mazda, as though one feels himself almost in communion with Him.¹" It is characteristic that in the Gāthās the word *hvaētu* very often stands in connection with the terms *verezenya*² and *airyamna*, signifying "an active labourer" fulfilling the desires of Mazda, and "joyful devotion" towards Him (XXXII, 1 ; XXXIII, 3, 4 ; XLIX, 7 ; XLVI, 1 ; LIII, 4). The Gāthā XXXII, 1 says :—"Unto Him may the allied³ aspire, his deeds coupled with devotion." In XXXIII, 3 and 4 Zara-

les repousser ou du moins de les ajourner : le *hvaētvadathō*, le mariage entre parents, devient par la simple application d'une loi d'écriture, *hvaētu-vadatha*, c'est-à-dire que le mot signifierait étymologiquement la chose qu'il désigne en fait : mais, si tentante que soit l'étymologie pour un sanscritiste, comme *vad* existe en zend, et que par suite, s'il était là, tradition qui connaissait le sens du mot entier n'avait aucune raison de le méconnaître, la forme pehlvie du mot *hvaētūk-dasih* nous prouvera que le mot doit se deviser comme le divisent les manuscrits, en *hvaētvadatha* ceci rend très douteuse l'étymologie de M. Geldner, qui a d'ailleurs l'inconvenient d'être trop logique et trop conforme au sens : les mots sont rarement des définitions."

¹ Comp. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. XVII. (1863), "Bemerkungen über einige Stellen des Avesta," by F. von Spiegel, pp. 58-69.

² According to Pahlavi, *verezenya* may mean "an active neighbour" of the Almighty.

³ The Rev. Dr. L. H. Mills, "A Study of the Gāthās," p. 87 :—" (his) Lord kinsman."

thushtara speaks :—(3) “ He is the best for the Righteous Lord, O Ahura ! who having knowledge, becomes Thy ally, Thy active labourer and Thy true devotee, and who arduously fosters the cow ; it is he who thinks himself to be in the service-field of *Asha* (Righteousness) and *Vohu-manô* (Good Mind).”—(4) “ O Mazda ! I hate whosoever is disobedient and evil-minded towards Thee, disregarding of Thy *ally*, a demon in close conflict with Thy *active labourer*, and the scorner of Thy *devoted one*, the most evil-minded against the nourishment of Thy cow ?”

These and several other like passages enable us to understand that *hvaētu* denotes one of the three spiritual qualifications which are requisite for human sanctity, viz., a communion with the Almighty, the practical fulfilment of His will, and the free mental devotion to Him. Likewise *khvîshîhî Yazdân*, “relationship or communion with the Deity”, is the frequent desire and motive of the pious *Mazdayasna* while discharging his moral or religious duties. It is a gift to which he aspires every moment.

Relying upon this meaning of *hvaēlu*, it is not difficult to assign an idea to *hvaēlvadatha*, which will harmonize with the context and be reconciled with the results of comparative philology. According to the Gāthās, it can only be "the gift of communion" with the Deity; etymologically, it may also mean "self-association," "self-dedication," &c.¹ In Gāh IV, 8, the term is used as an appellation of piety, where the passage runs—

-გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა
 -გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა
 -გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა
 -გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა - გეგმვა

“ I commend the youth of good thoughts, of good words, of good deeds, of good faith, who is pious and a preceptor (lord) of piety ; I praise the youth truth-speaking, virtuous and a preceptor of virtue ; I praise the *hvaētvadatha* youth, who is righteous and a preceptor of righteousness.” Here *hvaētvadatha* can very appropriately bear the idea of a most desirable attribute with which a pious youth might be gifted in the moments of devotion, viz., “ a communion with Ahura Mazda,” or “ self-dedication.”—Of the two remaining passages in Avesta, that in *Vendidad* VIII is so difficult and obscure that almost all the European translators have failed to discern any definite sense

¹ Should we attach importance to the meaning in which the word is sometimes found employed in the later Irānian writings, still 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 *khvêtûkdasih* could hardly denote "next-of-kin marriage." Only marriages between relations, whether near or distant, are therein referred to.

in it. Even the Pahlavi does not help us here, because of the mere transliteration of the Avesta words. What is most important to be considered is *Yasna* XII. 9 (Sp. Ys. XIII, 28), a passage in which Prof. F. von Spiegel and several German *savants* who follow his opinion, seem to discover traces of the precept of consanguineous marriage, (*vide* Geiger, *Ostirânische Kultur*, p. 246; Justi, *Altbaktrisch*, s. v.; Noeldeke, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. XVIII., s. v. Persia; Geldner, *Metrick*, s. v.). I have already remarked upon this passage in the first volume of my English translation of Prof. Wm. Geiger's *Ostirânische Kultur im Alterthum* (p. 66, note), and I beg to repeat that there is not the slightest indication that the passage in question has any reference to conjugal union of any kind; but, on the contrary, the term *hvaétvadutha* agreeing with the noun *daēna* "religion" in number, gender, and case, is evidently one of the epithets applied to the *Mazdayasnân* religion, and implies the virtue of that religion to offer the sacred medium of alliance with Ahura Mazda, or self-devotion towards Him. The Pahlavi Commentary plainly tells us that the manifestation of this gift of communion with the Deity on earth was due to Zoroastrism, while every stanza of the Gâthâs extols this highest and noblest ideal of the human spirit in the pious sentiments of Zarathushtra himself (*cfr.* Ys. XXVIII, 3, 4, 6, 7, etc.)

I quote and translate the passage (*Yasna* XII, 9) literally as follows :—

[illegible]

“ I extol the Mazda-worshipping religion, that is far from all doubt, that levels all disputes,¹ the sacred one, the *gift of communion* (with God) ; the greatest, the best, and the purest of all religions that have existed and will exist, which is (a manifestation) of Ahura and of Zarathushtra.”

Here it is impossible to conceive the idea of marriage between nearest relations in a passage which glorifies the virtues of a religion. Happily, my own humble conviction has been supported, with reference to the Avesta, by Dr. E. W. West, a scholar whose high and unrivalled attainments in Pahlavi in the European world of letters, will ever be a matter of pride to every English Orientalist. In his essay on the "Meaning of Khvetûk-das," appended to Vol. XVIII of Prof. Max Müller's edition of the "Sacred Books of the East" (pp. 389-430), the learned writer summarizes the result of his examination

¹ Comp. S. B. E. Vol. XXXI., Dr. Mill's translation :—"The Faith which has no faltering utterances the Faith that wields the felling halbert" (p. 250).

of all the passages referring to *hvaētvadatha* in the Avesta in the following manner (*vide* p. 427):—

“The term does not occur at all in the oldest part of the Avesta, and when it is mentioned in the later portion it is noticed merely as a good work which is highly meritorious, without any allusion to its nature; only one passage (*Vendidad*, VIII, 13) indicating that both men and women can participate in it. So far, therefore, as can be ascertained from the extant fragments of the Avesta—the only internal authority regarding the ancient practices of Mazda-worship—the Parsis are perfectly justified in believing that their religion did not originally sanction marriages between those who are next-of-kin.”

THE REFERENCES TO *Khvêtūk-dât* OR—

Khvêtūk-dasîh IN PAHLAVI.

III. In reference to the third proposition:—*That the Pahlavi passages translated by a distinguished English Pahlavi savant, and supposed to refer to such a custom, cannot be interpreted as upholding the view that next-of-kin marriages were expressly recommended therein; and that a few of the Pahlavi passages which are alleged to contain actual references to such marriages, do not allude to social realities, but only to supernatural conceptions relating to the creation of the first progenitors of mankind*—I beg to call your attention again to the exhaustive essay on this subject by the English Pahlavist, Dr. E. W. West, who seems to have raked the extensive field of Pahlavi literature, and collected with laborious industry all the Pahlavi passages bearing on the term *khvêtūk-dasîh*. This learned scholar expresses the result of his patient and useful research in the following words:—

“Unless the Parsis determine to reject the evidence of such Pahlavi works as the *Pahlavi Yasna*, the book of *Ardâ-Virâf*, the *Dînkard*, and the *Dâdistân-î-Dînîk*, or to attribute those books to heretical writers, they must admit that their priests in the later years of the Sâsânian dynasty, and for some centuries subsequently, strongly advocated such next-of-kin marriages, though probably with little success.” (*Vide* S. B. E., Vol. XVIII, p. 428.)

Thus, while Dr. West serves us as a useful champion to guard from any adverse stigma the sublime tenets of the Avesta regarding marriage, while he seems to doubt the authenticity of Greek historians as regards Persian matters (p. 389) we are deprived of his powerful support the moment we enter the field to defend ourselves against the obscure and detached evidences brought from Pahlavi *tomes*. Here I refer to the proofs which are put forward by the Pahlavi savant in support of his personal view that next-of-kin marriages were advocated by Persian priests in the later years of the Sâsânian monarchy.

It must be noticed here that this latter opinion of Dr. West differs completely, as regards the age in which the alleged custom might have prevailed,

from what was previously asserted in the first part of his "Pahlavi Texts" (S. B. E., Vol. V, p. 389, note 3), where the learned author observes :—" But it is quite conceivable that the Parsi priesthood, about the time of the Mahomedan conquest, were anxious to prevent marriages with strangers, in order to hinder conversions to the foreign faith, and that they may, therefore, have extended the range of marriage among near relations beyond the limits now approved by their descendants." Again, in a note to the fourth chapter of his English translation of the "Dīnā ī Mainū ī Khrat," Pahlavi Texts. Part III (S. B. E., Vol. XXIV, p. 26), he says that some centuries before the composition of that book, *i.e.*, long before the reign of Noshiravān, the term *khvêtūk-dasīh* was only confined to marriages between first cousins.

But all these remarks, gentlemen, go to show that Dr. West does not agree with other scholars in tracing in the Sacred Writings of the Irānians the existence of such a custom in the times of the Avesta, the Achæmenidæ, the Arsacidæ, or the Sāsānidæ generally ; but he gives as his opinion, that it may perhaps have been advocated by some priests in Irān in the sixth century A. D. or later. Thus the speculation of several European savants from Kleukar downwards, that the custom in question prevailed among the Avesta-people, has been dissipated by the inquiry of one of their own learned body.

However, in his discourse on the "Meaning of Khvêtūkdas," Dr. West attempts to translate about thirty Pahlavi passages to show how far *khvêtūk-dasīh* may denote next-of-kin marriage in Pahlavi. Five of these references are contained in the Pahlavi Translation of the Avesta, and two in the Pahlavi Commentary (*Yasna* XII, 9 ; *Visparad* III, 3 ; *Gāh* IV, 8 ; *Vishtāsp Yt.*, § 17 ; *Vendidād* VIII, 13 ; Pahl. gloss to *Ys.* XLIV, 4 ; and *Bahman Yt.*, Chap. II., 57, 61) ; eight of them belong to the *Dīnkard*, Bk. III, Chapters 80, 193, and 285, Bks. VI, VII, and IX : *Varshtmānsar Nask*, *Fargard* XVIII, § 27 ; *Bagān Nask* ; *Fd.* XIV, § 2 ; XXI, § 9) ; eight to the *Dādīstān-ī-Dīnīk* (Chaps. XXXVII, 82 ; LXIV, 6 ; LXV, 2 ; LXXVI, 4, 5 ; LXXVII, 6, 7 ; LXXVIII, 19) ; three to the *Mainū ī Khrat* (Chaps. IV, 4 ; XXXVI, 7 ; XXXVII, 12) ; and one to the Pahlavi *Ravāyet*.

It is needless to point out that of these thirty references more than twenty-two may be excluded from our inquiry, since, according to the result of Dr. West's own survey of them, it is admitted that "there is nothing in those passages to indicate the nature of the good work" meant by the word *khvêtūkdasīh* (namely, *Ys.* XII. 9 ; *Vsp.* III, 3 ; *Gāh.* IV, 8 ; *Vend.* VIII, 13 ; *Vishtāsp, Yt.* § 17 ; *Dk.*, Bk., III, Chaps. 193, 285 ; *Dk.*, Bk. VI ; *Mainū-ī-Khrat*, Chaps. IV, 4 ; XXXVI, 7 ; XXXVII, 12 ; and *Bahman Yasht*, II, 57, 61). Besides, the first five passages above-mentioned of the *Dādīstān-ī-Dīnīk* contain, according to him, mere "allusions to the brother and sister," who were the first progenitors of mankind. As for the remaining three of

the same book, he says, it is not certain that "the term is applied in them to the marriages between the nearest relatives." Consequently, we have to examine only nine passages out of thirty, viz., two of the *Bagān Nask*, one of the *Vārshtmānsar Nask*, three of the *Dīnkard*, one of the Pahlavi gloss to *Yasna* XLIV, 4, one of the Pahlavi *Arddā-Virāf*, and one of the Pahlavi *Ravāyet*, which, from the standpoint of Dr. West, contain direct or indirect traces of the practice of marriage between the next-of-kin.

Before we set out to consider these nine references, it will be useful to know the extent to which the work of *khvētāk-dasīh*—whatever may be its nature or meaning—is extolled or regarded as a righteous or meritorious action in the Pahlavi writings :—

In Chap. IV. of the Pahlavi *Dīnā ī Māīnā ī Khrat*, the reply to the question : "Which particular meritorious action is great and good ?" is as follows :—"The greatest meritorious action is liberality, and the second is truth and *khvētāk-dasīh*, the third is the *Gāsānbār*, the fourth is celebrating all the religious rites, the fifth is the worship of the sacred beings, and the providing of lodging for traders." Here *khvētāk-dasīh*, in connection with liberality and truth, might imply some moral habit almost equal to them in degree of excellence.

The *Shāyast Lā-shāyast*, Chap. VIII, 18, says : "*Khvētāk-dād* extirpates sins which deserve capital punishments." Also it is said by Ahura Mazda elsewhere :—"O Zaratūst ! of all those thoughts, words, and deeds, which I would proclaim, the practice of *khvētāk-dasīh* is the best to be thought performed, and uttered."

The *Bahman Yasht*, which may be regarded as one of the oldest Pahlavi works written on the *exegesis* of the Avesta, gives us a clear idea of the term. This idea best harmonizes with our notion regarding the meaning of Ys. XII, 9. It says in Chap. II, 57 :—"O Creator ! in that time of confusion" (i.e., after the conquest of Persia by the Arabs), "will there remain any people righteous ? Will there be religious persons who will preserve the *kūstī* on their waist, and who will perform the *Yazishné* rites by holding the *Barsams* ? And will the religion that is *khvētāk-das*, continue in their family ?" A little further on it says :—"The most perfectly righteous of the righteous will that person be who adheres or remains faithful to the good *Mazdayasnān* religion, whereby the religion that is *khvētāk-dasīh* will continue in his family." These two passages are supposed by Dr. West to be translations from the original Avesta text of the *Yasht* devoted to the archangel *Vôhu-manô* (S.B.E., Vol. V, Part I, p. 212, note).

In a passage in the *Shāyast Lā-shāyast* (chap. XVIII, 4), it is declared :—"Whosoever approximates four times to the practice of *khvētāk-dād*, will never be parted from Ahura Mazda and the Ameshaspendes."

I leave it to you, gentlemen, to say what signification ought to be attached to the word *khvêtāk-dasīh* from its connection with the moral and spiritual conceptions mentioned in the above citations. I need only assert that the moral excellence of *khvêtāk-dasīh* is parallel to truth and sanctity; that its attainment, according to the *Yāsna* and *Bahman Yasht*, is by the intermediary of the Zoroastrian religion of Ahura Mazda; and that the approximation to the condition of *khvêtāk-dasīh* is well nigh a participation in spiritual conference with the Almighty and the Ameshaspends or archangels. Consequently, it is a pious and noble gift of which the Zoroastrian conception must be purely moral, and not abominable as is the idea of marriage between the next-of-kin.

Referring to the eight Pahlavi passages under inquiry, it is with some hesitation that I find myself differing from the literal English translation of two of them, viz., the 80th chapter in the third book of the *Dīnkard*, and the twenty-first Fargard of the *Bagīn Nask*.

The difficulties of interpreting the often highly enigmatic and ambiguous Pahlavi are multifarious¹, and one is often astonished at the totally different versions of one and the same obscure passage, suggested by scholars of known ability, so much so that they appear to be versions of two quite distinct passages having no connection whatever with each other. Accordingly, it is permissible to assume that the ambiguous passages adduced by Dr. West, as seeming to allude directly or indirectly to consanguineous marriage, will bear quite another meaning from a still closer research than the first efforts of the learned translator seem to have benefited by. I think, therefore, it is as reasonable as appropriate to defer for the present any attempt on my part to give a definite translation of any of these extensive passages which are acknowledged by Dr. West himself to be obscure and difficult (S. B. E., Vol. V.,

¹ Comp. S. B. E., Vol. V., Introduction, pp. XVI—XVII.

"The alphabet used in Pahlavi books contains only fourteen distinct letters, so that some letters represent several different sounds; and this ambiguity is increased by the letters being joined together, when a compound of two letters is sometimes exactly like some other single letter. The complication arising from these ambiguities may be understood from the number of sounds, simple and compound, represented by each of the fourteen letters of the Pahlavi alphabet respectively:—

⌒ a, ā, ha, kha. 𐬀 ba. 𐬁 pa, fu, va-ṽta, da. 𐬂 cha, ja, za, va. 𐬃 ra, la. 𐬄 za. 𐬅 sa, yī, yad, yag, yaj, dī, dad, dag, daj, gī, gad, gag, gaj, jī, jad, jag, jaj (17 sounds). 𐬆 sha, sha, yā, yah, yakh, īh, ikh, dā, dah, dakh, gā, gah, gakh, jā, jah, jakh (16 sounds). 𐬇 gha, 𐬈 ka, ga, ī, 𐬉 m. 𐬊 na, va, wa, ū, ō, ra, la. 𐬋 ya, ī, ē, da, ga, ja.

. There are, in fact, some compounds of two letters which have from ten to fifteen sounds in common use, besides others which might possibly occur. If it be further considered that there are only three letters (which are also consonants as in most Semitic languages) to represent five long vowels, and that there are probably five short vowels to be understood, the difficulty of reading Pahlavi correctly may be readily imagined."

p. 389), contenting myself with giving briefly what remarks I have to make upon them.

One of these obscure passages constitutes the eightieth chapter in the third book of the *Dīnkard*. It is very extensive, and contains a long controversy between a Zoroastrian and a Jew,¹ concerning the propriety or impropriety of the doctrine of the Avesta as regards the creation of mankind, the different uses of the term *khvêtūk-dasîh*, &c. Herein it is difficult, owing to the confusion of different ideas as well as to the obscurity of the text, to distinguish the words of the Jew from those of the Zoroastrian. Any sentence that would seem to be a point in favour of the European view, may naturally be ascribed to the Zoroastrian as well as to the Jew. It is not, therefore, easy to determine whether it is the Zoroastrian or the Jew who advocates or condemns a particular position or custom. However the portions wherein both the Translators (Dastur Dr. Peshôtanji and Dr. E. W. West) agree, show that the term *khvêtūk-dasîh* is technically applied in this passage to supernatural unions, what are called the *khvêtūk-dasîh* between the father and the daughter, the son and the mother, the brother and the sister. We know that in the Avestâ, *Spentâ Armaiti* (Pahl. *Spendârmât*) is the female archangel, and as Ahurâ Mazda is called the Creator and Father of all archangels, *Spendârmât* is, therefore, called His daughter. Now, *Spendârmât* is believed to be the angel of the earth; and since from the earth God has created the first human being, *Spendârmât*, in the later Pahlavi writings, is alleged to have been spiritually associated with the Creator for such a mighty procreation as that of Gayômar, the first man according to Irânian cosmogony. Thus this supposed supernatural union passed into an ideal conception, and technically denoted what is called "the *khvêtūk-dasîh* between the Father and the daughter." Again, it is said that the seed of Gayômar fell into the mother-earth by whom he was begotten. So Mashiah and Mashîâneh were called the offspring of that union between Gayômar and *Spendârmât*, or of "the *khvêtūk-dasîh* between the son and the mother"; and since the first human pair was formed of brother and sister, viz., Mashiah and Mashîâneh, their union, which was an act in consonance with the Divine Will, came to denote "the *khvêtūk-dasîh* between the brother and the sister." This idea of *khvê-*

¹ The antagonism between the religious beliefs of the early Jews and those of the Mazdayasnians is well known to the *Dīnkard*, the *Maînu î Khrat*, the *Shâyast La-shâyast*, and the *Shikand Gûmânîk Vizâr*. The *Maînu î Khrat* records the destruction of Jerusalem by Kai Lohrasp and the predominance of the Zoroastrian faith therein. The *Shikand Gûmânîk Vizâr* points to some inconsistencies in the Jewish belief regarding the birth of Messiah. Its Chapter, XV, 31, states: "And there are some even" (according to Dr. West's translation) "who say that the Messiah is the sacred being himself. Now this is strange, when the mighty sacred Being, the maintainer and cherisher of the two existences, became of human nature and went into the womb of a woman who was a Jew. To leave the lordly throne, the sky and the earth, the celestial sphere and other similar objects of his management and protection, he fell for concealment into a polluted and straitened place."

tāk-dasīh, it must be remembered, is a later development of the abstract and religious notion of a direct spiritual alliance with the Deity, or of self-devotion. The term was afterwards applied to the unions of the first progenitors of mankind, which were believed to have been brought about by the operation of the Creator Himself. In creating man endowed with the knowledge of His Will, it was the Creator's design to raise up an opposition against the morally evil influence of Ahriman on earth. Accordingly, wherever the *khvétāk-dasīh* between the father and the daughter, the son and the mother, the brother and the sister, are referred to in the later Pahlavi writings, they do not imply any commendation of such unions among ordinary men, but only among the first human beings to whom they were naturally confined, to produce a uniform and pure race of mankind without any promiscuous blending with irrational creatures or animals. What are called the *khvétāk-dasīh* between the father and the daughter, the son and the mother, the brother and the sister, are, therefore, expressly the supernatural association between *Ahura Mazda* and *Spendārmāt*, between *Gayōmard* and *Spendārmāt*, and the union between *Mashiah* and *Mashīdneh*.

Now, as to the signification of the word *khvétāk-das*, the transition from meaning the gift of communion with the Almighty and with the supernatural powers, to meaning the gift of moral union between the human sexes or among mankind generally, is an easy and a natural step. Such an idea of a bond of union in a tribe, race, or family, is suggested by the writer of this eightieth chapter of the Dinkard in question. Notwithstanding, it is in the first passage and in the thirteenth that the English translator seems to have discovered a definite reference to consanguineous marriages. I may, therefore, be allowed to put forward in this place my own interpretation of these paras., to show that it is not next-of-kin marriages that they in any way recommend, but only moral or social union in a tribe, race, family, or near relations; and that the thirteenth passage explicitly condemns incestuous marriages as unlawful practices indulged in by lewd people. My version of the passages is as follows :—

“*Khvétāk-dasīh* means a gift of communion. Thus honour is obtained, and the union of power acquired by adherents, relatives, or fellow-creatures, through prayers to the Holy Self-existent One. In the treatise on human relationship, it is the (moral) union between the sexes in preparation for, and in continuity to the time of the resurrection. In order that this union might proceed more completely for ever, it should subsist between the innumerable kindred tribes, between adherents or co-religionists, between those who are nearly or closely connected.” What follows describes the application of the term to the three kinds of supernatural unions which were necessary for the procreation of a kindred human pair in this world. The passage says : “There were three kinds of *hampatvandīh* ‘co-relation,’ for example, between the Father (the Deity) and the daughter (*Spendārmāt*) ; between the

son (Gayômarđ) and the mother (Spendârmat) ; between the brother (Mashiah) and the sister (Mashyâneh). These I regard as the most primitive on the basis of an obscure exposition by a high-priest of the good religion."

The succeeding statement gives again a clear explanation regarding the propriety of such unions in the creation of mankind.

The thirteenth passage of the same chapter of the *Dinkard* says :—

"If a son be born of a son and a mother, he (the begetter) would be reckoned the brother as well as the father ; that would be illegal and incestuous (𐬕𐬀 *jêh*). If so, such a person has no part in the prayers (of the Deity) and in the joys (of Paradise) ; he produces harm, and does thereby no benefit ; he is extremely vicious and is not of a good aspect." (Cf. Dastur Peshotanji's Translation of the *Dinkard*, Vol. II, p. 97.)

It must also be observed that the allusion in this same passage to an *Arumân* or an inhabitant of Asia Minor, somewhat strengthens the opinion of the translator of the *Dinkard* as to the advocacy of the Jew himself for the marriage with a daughter, sister, etc. Dr. West admits that, in the portion where anything like "conjugal love" is meant, "marriages between first cousins appear to be referred to" (p. 410). The passage runs as follows :— "There are three kinds of affection between the offspring of brothers and sisters" (see Dr. West's rendering, p. 404) "one is this, where it is the offspring of brother and brother ; one is this, where the offspring is that of brothers and their sisters ; and one is this, where it is the offspring of sisters."

It is only to this passage, or to the period when it may have been composed, that we can ascribe the development of the idea of marriage relationship between cousins attached to the term *khvêtâk-dasîh* under the erroneous interpretation of its ambiguous paraphrase *khvîsh-dahêshnîh*, which occurs in it. Here the term implies the different degrees of union—first, between supernatural powers and the Deity ; next, between supernatural powers and mankind ; then, between the first man and woman,—hence the bond of moral or social union in a tribe, race, or family. The later interpretation, however, confines, as is expressly indicated in the Persian *Ravâjets*, love or marriage union among mankind only to such of the cousins as are described in the quotation mentioned in the preceding para. The idea of *khvêtâk-dâd*, denoting an act of forming relationship between cousins, has rarely been expressed again in the subsequent Pahlavi writings, nevertheless it has been preserved in the later Persian *Ravâjets* by *Kâmah Behreh*, *Kâus Kâmah*, and *Narimân Hûshang*.

Now, regarding the passage in the earlier part of the fourteenth *Fargard* of the *Bagân Nask*, it may well be remarked that the *khvêtâk-dasîh* of *Spendârmat* and *Ahura Mazda* here referred to is again, according to Dr. West's translation, an allusion to the communion of two spiritual powers for the

creation of man, and not an indication of marriage between a father and a daughter. Dr. West, likewise, observes (p. 196) :—"This quotation merely shows that *khvétúk-das* referred to connection between near relations, but whether the subsequent allusions to the daughterhood of *Spendârmât* had reference to the *khvétúk-das* of father and daughter is less certain than in the case of the Pahlavi *Yasna*, XLIV, 4." The same might also be said concerning the passage from the seventh book of the *Dinkard*, mentioned at page 412,¹ where we are informed, as Dr. West remarks only about the *khvétúk-dasih* of Mashîah and Mashîāneh.

Likewise, concerning the passage inserted irrelevantly in the Pahlavi Commentary to stanza 4, Yasna, Chapter XLIV, which refers to the *fatherhood of Ahura Mazda* and to the *daughterhood of Spendârmat*. The passage is rendered by Dr. West (p. 393) thus :—

“Thus I proclaim in the word that [which he who is Aûharmazd made his own] best [*Khvêtûk-das*]. By the aid of righteousness Aûharmazd is aware who created this one [to perform *Khvêtûk-das*]. And through fatherhood (of Aûharmazd) Vôhuman (referring to Gayômar) *was* cultivated by him, [that is, for the sake of the proper nurture of the creatures, *Khvêtûk-das was* performed by him]. So she who is his (Aûharmazd's) daughter is acting well, [who is the fully-minded] Spendârmât, [that is, she did not shrink from the act of *Khvêtûk-das*]. She was not deceived, [that is, she did not shrink from the act of *Khvêtûk-das*, because she is] an observer of every thing [as regards that which is Aûharmazd's, [that is, through the religion of Aûharmazd, *she* attains to all duty and law].”

From this quotation it is easy to see that here the reference is plainly to the particular supernatural *khvêtk-dasîh* of *Ahura Mazda* and *Spendârmat*, and not to any practice of consanguineous marriage among the old Irânians.


The passage in the latter part of the eighteenth Fargard of the *Varsh-mânsar Nask*, evidently describes, as the heading, འཕྲིན་རྒྱུ་བློ་གསལ་པེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་སྐུ་ཁྲུང་།

מָדָם *madam stâleishn frashôkart zimân*, actually indicates, the nature of the resurrection of the first parents of mankind, viz., Mashîah and Mashîâneh, their birth and union after the entire annihilation of evil, and the renovation and the reformation of the human world.

In reference to the passage in the Pahlavi *Ravāyet*, however, it may be suggested that the Pahlavi expression *khvētdāk-dasēh levatā bordār va bentā vabīdāntan*, as used in a couple of sentences, might well denote the exercise of the gift of communion with the Almighty, or self-devotion, in association with one's mother, daughter, or sister; in a word, it must have been considered as highly commendable and meritorious that a whole Zoroastrian

¹ *Vide* S. B. E. Vol. XVIII.

household should be given to devotion or pious resignation to the Will of the Supreme Lord of the Zoroastrian religion.

There now remain two passages which claim our particular attention. One of these belongs to the book of the *Ardā Virāf*, another to the *Dīnkard* in the twenty-first Fargard of the *Bagān Nask*. The passage in *Virāf* in which European scholars discover the alleged practice of marriage between brothers and sisters, runs as follows :—" *Virāf* had seven sisters, and all these seven sisters were like a wife unto *Virāf* " —They spoke thus : " Do not this thing, ye *Mazdayasna*, for we are seven sisters and he is an only brother, and we are all seven sisters like a wife unto that brother." Here arises an important question, whether it is possible to conclude hence that those seven sisters were actually married to *Virāf*, or that they were merely dependant upon him for their sustenance, just as a wife is dependent upon her husband. It is, indeed, characteristic that the sisters do not call *Virāf* their husband, but their brother, and they further regret that the disappearance of their brother from this life should deprive them of their only support in this world. Again, the Pahlavi word  *chīgūn*, " like," implies a condition similar to that of a wife and not the actual condition of a wife. Such an expression of similarity was quite unnecessary, if those sisters were actually the wives of *Virāf*. On the other hand, there is a difference in the words of the two oldest texts from which all subsequent copies were transcribed. A copy which is preserved in the collection of Dr. Haug's MSS., and dated *Samvat* 1466, has quite a different word, *zanān*, " wives " in the place of *akhtman*, " sister." If we should accept the former word, the meaning would be " *Virāf* had seven wives, who were all sisters." By-the-bye it is difficult to conceive how *Virāf*, one of the most pious men of his day, should have been so luxurious or licentious as to take as his wives all his seven sisters, an instance altogether unparalleled in the whole history of Ancient Persia. The passage in question, I believe, expressly points to an instance of the dependent condition of women not unknown to the Zoroastrian community, of unmarried sisters or daughters being wholly supported in life by parents, a brother, or even a brother-in-law. It rather represents an extreme case of rigid seclusion on the part of *Virāf* and his austere exercise of acts of piety, devotion, and self-denial.

The next passage which is assumed by the English translator to be a reference to the marriage of a father and a daughter and " too clear," according to him, " to admit of mistake, though the term *khvêtāk-das* is not mentioned," is cited from the middle of the *Vahishtōk Yasht* Fargard of the *Bagān Nask*. The contents of this Fargard are summarized in a Pahlavi version of it, and found about the end of the *Dīnkard*. Regarding this ambiguous citation, it may be observed that it admits of more than two significations, the choice between which is made to suit the particular construction and interpretation adopted by the translator. Generally speaking, this twenty

first Fargard of the *Bagân Nask* seems to esteem, among other acts of religious credit, the exaltedness of a modest attitude of respect, which a woman observes towards her father or husband. "*Tarsgâsîh bân abîtar va shôè*" is an expression which denotes, literally, "awful respect to one's father or husband," and is a special point of female morals frequently urged in the sayings of the ancient Irânian sages or high priests. The same idea appears to have been inculcated by this passage of the *Bagân Nask*, which, if rendered accordingly, would put forward a meaning quite different from the one expressed by Dr. West, whose version of the Pahlavi text runs as follows (p. 397):—

"And this, too, that a daughter is given in marriage to a father, even so as a woman to another man, by him who teaches the daughter and the other woman the reverence due unto father and husband."

According to my humble interpretation, the passage would convey quite a different idea. I translate the passage thus:—

"And this, likewise (is a virtuous act), that a woman pays respect to another man (or stranger), just as it is paid by a daughter to her father, in her womanhood or married condition, through him who teaches his own daughter or any other woman respect towards one's father or husband."

Here we have a religious position ascribed to a person who inculcates on women a modest and respectful behaviour towards male strangers and nearest male relations. This passage does not expressly imply any notion of marriage, on the contrary, it points to modest reverence which in every Oriental community is due from a woman to a male stranger, from a wife to her husband, or from a daughter to her father, etc.

Even if we should accept the interpretation of Dr. West—as one might be constrained to do by the ambiguity, obscurity, or erroneous transcription of the original text of all the Pahlavi passages under inquiry—still it would be difficult to prove that next-of-kin marriages were actually practised in Irân even "in the later years of the Sāsānian monarchy." His statement only indicates that incestuous marriages were merely advocated¹ by one or more Pahlavi writers on account of their misapprehension of the Avestā tenets, and also "with very little success."

Finally, in support of the view that even the genuine Pahlavi writings do not proclaim as meritorious a practice which in the eye of reason and culture is highly discreditable, I may be allowed to adduce a passage from the seventh book of the *Dinkard*, on the supernatural manifestations of Zoroaster's spiritual powers. This passage expressly ascribes to the Mazdakian followers the vicious practice of promiscuous intercourse between the sexes, denouncing those who indulged in it as of the nature of wolves or obnoxious creatures.

¹ This may well be ascribed to the ignorance or erroneous notions of the subsequent Pahlavi copyists.

(“ Ahura Mazda spoke ”): “ And again of the adversaries of the *Mazdayasnān* religion, and of the disturbers of piety, the *Aharmōg* (Mazdak) and they who will be called also Mazdakians. . . . will declare one's offspring as fit for mutual intercourse, that is, they will announce intercourse with mothers, and they will be called wolves, since they will act like wolves, they will proceed according to their lustful desire just as one born of the wolf does with its daughter or mother, and they will also practice intercourse with their mothers, their women will live like sheep or goats.”

THE NOBLE IDEA OF THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP
IN THE AVESTA.

“Admonishing words I say unto the marrying maiden,
“And to you (the youth), I who know you. Listen to them,

שנה ראשונה לאדמונת המלך ואלה שמות המלכים אשר באו אליו
 למלכותם ראשון יאמר (Pöruclia) שני יאמר (Jámásp) שלישי

"And learn to know through the laws of religion the life of a good mind;

"In piety you shall both seek to win the love of each other, only thus will it lead you to joy!" (*Yasna* LIIL, 5;¹ vide my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," *supra*. p. 150.)

Although the Avestā text, of which the larger portion is destroyed or lost, is a scanty collection of fragments in its present condition, still there is no lack of references which show us that the custom of contracting marriages amongst the Irānians in the age of the Avesta, cannot at all be reconciled with any theory of incestuous wedlock. The expression *moshu-jaidhyamna*, "courting or solicitation," direct or indirect, for the hand of a maiden, and its root *vadh* or *vaz*, "to convey or take home the wife" (*ducere puellam in matrimonium*), presuppose that intermarriage between different families or citizens was not unknown to the Avesta nation. The idea of conveying a bride to the house of the bridegroom, which is implied in the Av. root *vadh* (signifying in the Zend-Avesta "to marry"), implicitly contradicts the notion of several European scholars that the Avesta people were fond of marrying in their own family only, and with their nearest relations. Besides, the moral position of the wife in the Irānian household, was in no way inferior to that of an English *materfamilias*. Similar as she was in rank to her husband, her chastity was an ornament to the house, and her piety and participation in private and public ceremonies a blessing. Moreover, the prayer of an Irānian maiden imploring the *Yazata Vayu* for a husband, does not at all allude to any desire for marrying a next-of-kin relation, but simply an Irānian youth who may be valiant, wise, and learned:—

"Grant us this grace, that we may obtain a husband, a youthful one, one of surpassing beauty, who may procure us sustenance as long as we have to live with each other; and who will beget of us offspring; a wise, learned, and ready-tongued husband" (*vide* my C. E. Irānians, *supra*. p. 149; Yt. XV, 40).

Further, there is no trace of consanguinity in *Vendidad*, chap. XIV., where one of the meritorious acts of a Zoroastrian priest or layman, is to give his daughter in marriage to any pious *Mazdayasna*. It is characteristic that wherever the subject of marriage is alluded to in the Avestā the word *hvaēt-vadatha* is never mentioned. It is also to be remembered that Zarathushtra having six children born to him, three sons and three daughters, did not think of marrying his own son with his own daughter, nor did he ever take his own mother or one of his own daughters to wife. If it was actually the creed of the Prophet, Zoroaster ought to have realized it first of all in his own family and among his primitive supporters.

¹The last verse is translated by Dr. Mills: "And to you, bride and bridegroom), let each one of the other in Righteousness cherish; thus alone unto each shall the home-life be happy."—*Vide* S. B. E., Vol. XXXI., p. 192.)

The question as regards the existence of the practice of consanguineous marriages in ancient Irān, will not, I hope, create a difficulty for any longer time. Not only has the meagre testimony upon it of Greek and Roman historians been shown to be unreliable and erroneous, but also the attempt to trace it to the old Irānian Sacred Books, *viz.*, the Zend-Avesta, has entirely failed.

So long as no cogent proofs are brought to bear on the question, sufficient to convince a student of Irānian antiquities or religion, I shall be content with the arguments or remarks I have been able to put forward on the other side, repeating at the conclusion of this paper the convictions with which I set out, *viz.* :—

I. That the *slight authority of some isolated passages* gleaned from the pages of Greek and Roman literature, is wholly insufficient to support the odious charge made against the old Irānians of practising consanguineous marriages in their most objectionable forms.

II. That no trace, hint, or suggestion of a custom of next-of-kin marriage can be pointed out in the Avestā or in its Pahlavi Version.

III. That the Pahlavi passages translated by a distinguished English Pahlavi, savant, and supposed to refer to such a custom, cannot be interpreted as upholding the view that consanguineous marriages were expressly recommended therein. That a few of the Pahlavi passages, which are alleged to contain actual references to such marriages, do not allude to social realities but to supernatural conceptions relating to the creation, and to the first progenitors of mankind.

IV. That the words of our Prophet himself, which are preserved in one of the stanzas of the Gāthā, chap. LIII, express a highly moral ideal of the marriage-relationship.

THE PRESIDENT'S OPINION.*

The Honourable Sir Raymond West,¹ in proposing a vote of thanks to the lecturer, said :—You will all agree with me that the paper that has been just read is a very important one, and we are very much indebted to Mr. Sanjana for reading it and adding so much to the treasures of the Society. I hope it will be ranked amongst the papers which deserve to be printed and enshrined in our records. There is a special appropriateness in a Parsee priest

* [Extract from the *Proceeding of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society for the month of April 1887.*] There were present on the occasion: Sir Jamshedji Jijibhai, Bart., C.S.I., Mr. Justice Jardine, Mr. C. E. Fox, Mr. Kharshedji Fardunji Parakh, Mr. Sorabji Shapurji Bengali, C.I.E., Sir Jehangir Readymoney, Dr. J. G. da Cunha, Mr. Kharshedji Rustomji Cama, Mr. Jamshedji Bahmanji Wadia, Surgeon Steele, Dr. Atmaram Pandurang Dr. de Monte, Mr. Jamshedji Kharshedji Jamshedji Segnior O. S. Pedraza, Mr. Javerilal Umia Shankar Yajnik, and others.

¹ He is now Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

bringing forward the subject which affected the honour and credit of his race and religion, and I can scarcely imagine that the work could have been done with better spirit, greater clearness, and better appreciation of the historical and scientific evidentiary method in which to go to work upon a task of that particular kind.

I cannot pretend to the knowledge of Zend and Pahlavi that would enable me to discuss with any profit the proper sense of the much-debated expression on which Mr. Sanjana has expended such close and searching criticism. I will but offer a few remarks on the general aspects of the question which he has handled with so much learning and zeal. It is evident, on a reference to Herodotus, who is the only one of the Greek writers quoted to whom I have been able to make a direct reference, but equally evident from the, no doubt, correct quotations from the other Greek authors, that they wrote rather from loose popular stories, and with a view to satisfy their reader's taste for the marvellous than from a thorough and critical examination of the subject of consanguineous marriages, as one of momentous importance.

Herodotus has been confirmed in so many instances in which it seemed most unlikely that he has gained, and well deserves just confidence whenever he relates anything as within his personal knowledge; but of the subject of King Cambyzes' marriage, he must needs have gathered his information at second-hand. The other Greek writers hardly profess to do more than retail their stories out of a stock gathered with industry no doubt, but entirely without the control of the critical spirit which in modern times we have learned to consider so indispensable. Ctesias, who must have known a great deal about Persia and its people, from original observation, has told so many undoubted falsehoods that his evidence is unworthy of credit on any contested point. The first sources of European information on the subject before us are thus remarkably unsatisfactory, yet it is to be feared that it is with impressions derived from these sources that the Western scholars have approached the Parsee literature. So influenced they may very naturally have construed the mysterious and rare phrases supposed to involve a sanction of incestuous unions, in a frame of mind which had led to illusions such as the Dastur has insisted on and striven to dispel.

One would gather from the narrative in Herodotus that the marriage of Cambyzes was of a kind to startle and shock the sensibilities of his people—else why recount it? That would indicate very probably the survival in the popular legends, drawn from a pre-historic time, of some ancient tale of wrong which the popular fancy was pleased to annex to a king who had played so great a part and had so terrible a history as Cambyzes. In almost every country one may observe a tendency, when some ruler or chief has taken a strong hold of the popular imagination, to tack on to his biography any floating legend that wants a personal centre that story-tellers and readers can clothe

with a certain reality. In England the group of legends that gathers round the British hero, King Arthur, affords an illustration of this. Some scholars have assigned a similar origin to the stories of Achilles and Odysseus in the two great poems commonly ascribed to Homer. At a later time many stray legends went to add to the glory of Robin Hood, and in Ireland still unowned achievements of daring and ferocity are commonly assigned to Cromwell. In Eastern countries the sovereign and the royal family are looked on—and still more were looked on—as standing so entirely apart from the common people, that any tale of wonder or horror would almost inevitably be connected with them. They really do so many things exceeding ordinary experience, that listeners of uncritical character, not knowing where to draw the line, would accept without question statements of other things quite incredible or even unnatural.

It must be admitted, too, that these Eastern monarchs and royal families might easily learn in ancient times, as they have in modern times, to think there was something sacred about their persons which made ordinary offences no sins in them. A course of adulation and superiority to legal coercion readily breed a contempt of moral restraints. It commonly produces an inordinate pride. We might thus have a Persian prince indulging in unions like the king of Egypt and the Incas of Peru, which would, after all, be only in them the practice, or the casual excesses, of tyrants besotted with despotic power. Germany in the last century was full of royal foulness, which yet stood quite apart from the general life of the people. Unbridled lust disturbs the reason almost more than any other passion. History abounds in instances of it, and if Persian despots and their children were sometimes incestuous in their moral delirium, we should not be justified in reasoning from such instances to any custom of the people. The stories rather imply that these excesses were startling, and probably revolting, as were the tales at one time current about James the Sixth of Scotland and First of England.

If one applies to the narratives of the Greek writers, the tests by which one would pronounce on the guilt or innocence of an accused, it may, I think, safely be said the evidence is insufficient.

It would then surely be wrong to convict an otherwise highly moral nation, endowed with fine sensibilities, of a revolting practice, on the testimony on which one would not condemn a pick-pocket.

It is very likely, indeed, that the ancient Persians, like other nations, before their emergence from the savage state, looked without disfavour on connexions that we now cannot think of without a shudder. The prevalence of family polyandry is as well authenticated as any fact in Anthropology. The ancient Britons had one or more wives for a group of brothers, so had the Spartans. A similar arrangement prevails among some of the Himalayan tribes, and traces of it are to be found in the Hindu law literature. The

children in such cases are formally attributed to the eldest brother. A communal system, under which all the females were common to the tribe, seems in many cases to have preceded the family polyandry on the arrangements that we may see still amongst the Nairs. Where such a system prevailed it would very often be impossible to say whether a young woman about to be taken by a young man was or was not his sister. If she had been born of a different mother, she could not be more than his half-sister, and as civilization advanced and the family was founded on the basis of single known paternity, the half-sister in Greece continued to be regarded as a proper spouse for her half-brothers. A marriage of such persons furthered the policy of the Greek statesmen by keeping the family estates together. Amongst the Jews also, who, as we know, recognised the levirate which the Hindus first commanded and afterwards condemned, union with a half-sister by a different mother must have been recognized as allowable, at any rate by dispensation from the chief in David's time. This is evident from the story of Amnon and Tamar; and we may gather that the practice had once been common. In the Polynesian Islands there are tribes of which all the women are common to all the men of other particular tribes. When the children, as commonly, take their classification from the mother, it is obvious that consanguineous unions must be frequent. They seem even to be regarded in some cases as connected with religious needs, since at certain festivals all restraints on licentiousness are cast aside even amongst males and females of the same family who do not ordinarily even speak to each other.

There seems to be everywhere tendency to connect sexual anomalies with the mysteries of religion, and with persons of extraordinary national importance. The account given of the parentage of Moses, if taken literally, makes him the offspring of a nephew and an aunt. Beings who are so highly exalted are supposed to be quite beyond the ordinary standard.

Both these sources of legends may have been in operation in ancient Persia, as it was known, and but superficially known to the Greeks. There too, no doubt, as elsewhere, the transition from female to male gentileship was attended with a period of great confusion. A similar change took place, it seems, amongst the Hindus at a very early time; and in Greece Orostes is almost inclined to insist that he was not related to his own mother. As one set of relationships took the place of another, many apparently strange connections would be formed which yet would not really be incestuous when properly understood. Language would adapt itself, as we see in fact it did, but imperfectly, to the change of the family system. The Greeks probably knew Persian very imperfectly. In this country the young civilian is continually puzzled by finding words of relationship received in a much wider sense than their usual English equivalents, and the Greeks may well have found equal difficulty in catching the precise sense of Persian terms of relationship in the tales that were told to them. Their own system would make

them take some narratives as quite rational, which to us are revolting; in other cases the strangeness of the story told of a king or prince would prevent a critical examination of the terms employed. It would be welcome just in proportion as it was outrageous.

It seems likely that such considerations as these may not have been allowed due weight by European scholars in their interpretation of the few passages in which an ambiguous phrase seems to countenance the notion that incest is recommended. I venture to suggest, as I have been able to do in my conversation with my learned friend, Mr. Sanjana, that a sense akin to that of *svyamdatta* in Sanskrit—an idea of self-devotion, varying according to the context in its precise intention—would satisfy the exigencies of all or nearly all the doubtful passages. This, however, is no more than a speculation: I cannot judge its worth. I can only thank Mr. Sanjana on behalf of the Society, and most sincerely, for the very valuable addition he has contributed to our transactions. I trust it will form a new starting-point in history and criticism by the view it presents to European scholars.

SYAVAKHSH AND SUDABEH.¹

IN the controversy which has up to now mustered the *pros* and *cons* with regard to my dissertation on the "Alleged Practice of Next-of-kin Marriages in Old Iran," it is a pleasure to notice how far European *savants* have been compelled to review the basis of their sweeping assertion that incest was a common practice in the life of the ancient Persian. It seems that a serious consideration of my arguments has caused a certain modification in the European standpoint. Impartial thought results in the plain confession that neither is incest² proscribed, nor are next-of-kin marriages recommended, by the Avesta. Greek authorities on the question are no longer quoted without caution. The only weapons that the dogmatist can find to wield against my position, seem to me to consist of such equivocal Pahlavi expressions as admit of more than one meaning, or of such passages in the *Shâh-Nâmah*, &c., as have no bearing upon actual marriage ties, but only describe rare immoral acts of a prince or princess.

In a recent number of the "Babylonian and Oriental Record" we have been favoured with notes on *Qaêtvadatha*, by the well-known scholar Dr. L. C. Casartelli of Manchester, with reference to Dr. Hubschmann's paper on this subject, "Ueber die persische Venwandtenheirath," published in the second number of the "Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft," Journal of the German Oriental Society.³ Notwithstanding his remark that "Dr. H. Hubschmann entirely agrees with Darab that, as far at least as the Avesta itself is concerned, the Zend term 'qaetva-datha' has by no means been proved to bear the meaning of incestuous marriage;—nay, that this interpretation is 'not even probable' (this he proves at some length by an examination of the passages wherein it occurs:)" this learned doctor (Casartelli), on the authority of Prof. Italo Pizzi, points to a certain episode in the *Shâh-Nâmah*, and tries to prove that incest did prevail in ancient Persia. It is, here, needless to dwell at length upon this subject. It is only necessary to consider what direct proofs can be drawn from Firdusi, the writer of that Persian epic. In the record above mentioned Dr. Casartelli's remarks run as follows :—

"Those again who are not acquainted with Prof. Italo Pizzi's interesting book on the 'Manners and Customs of the Heroic Age of Persia,' as preserved in the Poem of Firdusi, ('L'Epopée Persiana e la vita e i Costumi dei Tempi Eroi di Persia,' Firenze, 1888), may be glad to see what light, in the opinion

¹ A supplement to my lecture on the "Alleged Practice of Next-of-kin Marriages in Old Iran," delivered in April, 1887. See my contribution to the *Bombay Gazette*, dated 12th November, 1890.

² In the sense of marriages within proscribed degree of blood or family relationship.

³ 1890.

of the Italian Eranist, is cast upon the subject by national Persian tradition. Pizzi writes on p. 191—after stating the motives for marriages of near kindred, and quoting the Greek and other testimonies,—‘Of these marriages among relations we have but few examples in Firdusi’s ‘Book of Kings.’ But the traces of them, though rare, are sufficiently clear. Sudabeh, in fact, proposes to the young Siyavush marriage with one of her daughters. In that case the bride would have been a sister of Siyavish, at least on the father’s side, as King Kavus was father of Siyavish and husband of Sudabeh. But Sudabeh went much further and proposed to Siyavish, with whom she was in love, that when old Kavus died, he might ask her for his wife and thus console his grief, which would have meant Siyavush’s marrying his mother-in-law.”¹

The writer here does not refer to a single short extract, but to an extensive episode relating to Sudabeh and Syavakhsh, which runs over more than 500 couplets. (*Vide* “Le Livre des Rois,” par A. Firdusi, publié, traduit et commenté par M. Jules Mohl, tome second, Paris, Imprimerie Royale 1842, pp. 208-230.)²

Firdusi calls the prince Syavakhsh or Syavush. The name is identical with the Pahl. “Syavarsh” as well as the Avesta “Syavarshana,” *lit.* ‘the black man.’ He is mentioned in the Avesta, in Yashts IX. 18; XVII. 42; XIX. 77; and in the Afrin-i-Zarthusht, etc. He is the son of Kai-Kâus, Av. Kava Usa, the eldest son of Kavi Kavâta, and brother of Kavi Arshna and Kavi Pishina (Yt. XIII. 132; XIX. 71). Sudabeh, Av. “Sutavangha,” whom Masoudi names “Soada,” is the daughter of Shammar, King of Hamavar (see ‘Barbier de Meynard,’ II., 119), and wife of Kai-Kâus.

It is to be observed that Syavakhsh was not born of Sudabeh, but that the latter was his step-mother, and daughter of the King of Hamavar, who had treacherously imprisoned Kai-Kâus, her husband, and often endeavoured to throw off his allegiance to that Iranian monarch. We should further consider the motive which would have actuated Sudabeh to propose incestuous union with her step-son, Syavakhsh, and also what sentiments were uttered by that prince when such an unnatural proposal was made to him. I would refer my readers to the literal French translation of the episode, which is

¹ I here only touch upon this first reference, since it is to my mind worth noticing. —Dr. Casartelli says further on: “Moreover Rustem had married a sister of Ghev, by which he had a son Feramruz, whilst Ghev was the husband of Banu Gushasp, Rustem’s daughter.” In this remark there is evidently an error. Ghev, Av. Gaevani, the son-in-law of Rustam, Pahl. “Rudastam,” cannot be his wife’s brother. I should ask the learned scholar to prove that Rustam was ever married to a daughter of Gudarz, the father of Gov. Ghev, the son-in-law of Rustem, may be a cousin of Banu Aram.—As for the last allusion to King Behman, I refer my learned friend to my refutation of the question in pp. 36-38 of my “Next-of-kin Marriages in Old Iran.”

² Compare Zimmermann’s “Heroic Tales Retold from Firdusi,” pp. 172 seq.

contained in Mohl's second volume, pp. 208-230. For the purpose of this paper the following passages from the free English version of select extracts from the *Shâh-Nâmâh*, by Atkinson,¹ would be sufficient :—

“The history of the adventure of Kâus at Hamaveran, and what the king and his warriors endured in consequence of the treachery of the father of Sudabeh, flashed upon his (Syavakhsh's) mind.² He, therefore, was full of apprehension, and breathed not a word in answer to her fondness. Sudabeh observing his silence and reluctance, threw away from herself the veil of modesty.

“And said: ‘O be my own, for I am thine, and clasp me in thy arms!’ And then she sprang to the astonished boy, and eagerly kissed his deep crimsoned cheek, which filled his soul with strange confusion. ‘When the king is dead, O take me to thyself; see how I stand, body and soul devoted unto thee.’ In his heart he said: ‘This never can be: this is a demon's work—shall I be treacherous? What! to my own dear father? Never, never; I will not thus be tempted by the devil; yet must I not be cold to this wild woman, for fear of further folly.’

¹ “The Shah Nameh” of Firdusi, translated and abridged in Prose and Verse, by J. Atkinson (London, 1886), pp. 146, 147.

² The original verses of the *Shâh-Nâmâh*, in Mohl's edition, Vol. II, pp. 220-224, run as follows :—

(1) من اینک به پیش تو اسفاده ام .: تن و جان روشن تو داده ام
 ز من هر چه خواهی همی کام تو .: بر آید نه پیچم سر از دام تو
 رخس تنگ بگرفت و یک بوسه داد .: چنانا که از شرم نآورد یاد

رخان میاوش چو گل شد ز شرم .: بیمار است مزگان بطوناب گرم
 چنین گفت بادل که از کار دیو .: مرا دور دارد کیوان خدیو
 نه من با پدر بیوفائی کنم .: نه با اهرمن آشنائی کنم
 اگر سرد گویم بدین شوخ چشم .: بجوشد دلش گرم گردد ز خشم

(2) بهانه چه داری که از مهر من .: به پیچی زبالا و از چهر من
 که تا من نترادیده ام مرده ام .: خروشان و جوشان و آزرده ام
 همی روز روشن نه بینم ز درد .: بر آنم که خورشد شد لا جور
 کنون هفت سال است تا مهر من .: همی خون چکاند برین چهر من
 یکی شاد کن در نهانی مرا .: ببخشای روز جوانی مرا
 فزون ز آنکه دادی جهاندار شاه .: بیمار ایست تاج و تخت و کلاه
 و گو سر بپیچم ز فرمان من .: نیاید دلت سوی درمان من
 کنم بر تو این پادشاهی تباہ .: شود تیره بر روی تو نور و ماه

(3) میاوش بدو گفت که هرگز میباد .: که از بهر دل من دهم سر بباد
 چنین با پدر بیوفائی کنم .: ز مردی و دانش جدائی کنم
 تو بانوی شاهی و خورشید گاه .: سزد کز تو آید بدینسان گناه

"On another day she sent for him, and exclaimed :—' I cannot now dissemble ; since I saw thee I seem to be as dead—my heart all withered, seven years have passed in unrequited love—seven long, long years. O ! be not still obdurate, but with the generous impulse of affection, Oh, bless my anxious spirit, or refusing, thy life will be in peril ; thou shalt die ! ' ' Never,' replied the youth ; ' O, never, never ; Oh, ask me not, for this can never be.' " ¹

I have here to repeat what I have already emphasized in my lectures, that in this episode the positive refusal and repugnance of Syavakhsh to his step-mother's treacherous allurements, evidently prove that no such practice was in favour with the royal blood in the time of Kai-Kâus. Were incestuous marriages admissible, what possible reason would the prince have for describing the proposal as " a demon's work," as the act of a treacherous and wild woman ? Further, it is to be remembered that the sincerity of Sudabeh's invitation is not beyond question. It is easy to surmise that if submitted to by the prince, it would have enabled Sudabeh to carry out her design for removing Syavakhsh, who was heir to the Iranian throne, but was not her own son.² The English translator further relates ³ :—

"Syavakhsh then rose to depart precipitately, but Sudabeh observing him, endeavoured to cling round him and arrest his flight. The endeavour, however, was fruitless ; and finding at length her situation desperate, she determined to turn the adventure into her own favour by accusing Syavakhsh of an atrocious outrage on her own person and virtue. She, accordingly, tore her dress, screamed aloud, and rushed out of her apartment to inform Kâus of the indignity she had suffered."

Here, I believe, we light upon an interesting element of political intrigue. There is the insincere expression of maternal love on the part of Sudabeh, the unwilling visit of Syavakhsh to her palace (forced by the command of his father, King Kai-Kâus), the unnatural solicitation of the prince by his step-mother, the refusal of the former to accept her unlawful overtures, and, lastly, the innocence of the prince and the perfidious accusation against him by Sudabeh. An intrigue with such an object not unknown in the political history of ancient Persia, cannot lead us to conclude that there was any natural or actual proposal for the hand of the prince, or that such a proposal would have passed without a meet penalty as an offence against the throne. Even granted that such a proposal were sincere, is there the slightest ground for attempting

¹ Relying on the authority of Prof. Mohl's French Translation of the *Shâh-Nâmâh*, Zimmern speaks about it as follows :—

"It came about that Sudaveh beheld the youth of Saiawush, and her eyes were filled with his beauty, and her soul burned after him, so she sent unto him a messenger and invited him to enter the house of the women. But he sent in answer words of excuse, for he trusted her not."

² The first act of the prince on succeeding to the throne, would naturally be the banishment of Sudabeh, daughter of Shammar, the hereditary enemy of Iran.

³ Vide p. 147 of Atkinson.

to prove from it the existence of marriages amongst the next-of-kin ? Was any such marriage ever consummated between Syavakhsh and Sudabeh ? When the solicitations of Sudabeh are plainly characterized by Syavakhsh as a temptation of the devil, I am at a loss to see why my learned friend Dr. Casartelli should yearn to find in this story an important clue to incestuous marriages in old Iran.

There is another interesting allusion to the same episode. "Sudabeh proposes to the young Siyavish marriage with one of her daughters. In that case the bride would have been a sister of Siyavish." It is surprising to find that European *savants*, notwithstanding their extensive knowledge of Oriental customs, have often failed to comprehend correctly the several forms of Oriental etiquette and address. I beg to submit that some Eastern terms for mother, daughter or sister, are not to be as strictly interpreted as such words are in Western languages. Those Europeans who have been accustomed to the Indian style of address, may have noticed that the Hindustani words "*ammā*" or "*mā*," and the Gujerati "*māyaji*" do not literally denote "mother" in every case, but are generally used as expressions of address to any lady at the head of a household or to any elderly woman in the ordinary sense of the English "madam." So also the designations for sisters and daughters, are not used strictly in their literal sense, but they are a common form of address to ordinary young girls, female visitors, relations, cousins, &c. When, therefore, Sudabeh calls the young maidens of her palace her "daughters," it does not necessarily mean that they were her own actual offspring, but the term would be applicable to the daughters of relations, nobles, or other allied princes ; and so any proposal for the hand of one of the so-called "daughters," does not in the least prove that the proposed bride was the offspring of Kai-Kâus.

I conclude this paper with general observations upon the reasons which have thrown some European Iranists into the palpable error of attributing the practice of next-of-kin marriages to the early Zoroastrians. It is a well-known fact that the *Shâh-Nâmah* is partly based on indigenous traditions preserved in the old Persian or Pahlavi literature extant in the time of Firdusi. The Pahlavi fragments of *Karnâmak-i-Artakhshtar-i-Pâpakân* (containing about 5,600 words, equal to thirty octavo pages), *Yâdgâr-i-Zarirân* (wrongly styled the *Pahlavi Shâh-Nâmah*, since it contains about 3,000 words, equal only to fifteen octavo pages—a short account of the war between Gushtasp and Arjasp), as well as the fourth book of the *Dinkard* (extending to about 4,000 words, and containing a description of the exploits of various Iranian monarchs from Gushtasp to Noshirvan), have lately been submitted to close research. These writings have furnished us with plain proofs that the epic of the *Shâh-Nâmah* and other genuine Persian books relating to the earliest period of Iranian monarchy, were neither myths nor fictions, but, to a certain extent, reliable works, the offspring of the earlier Pahlavi, which has not

survived in its entirety. Hence it is not difficult to trace the error of the European view. We begin with the assertion that later Persian history is the outcome of its Pahlavi predecessor. For that reason I presume that ordinary Persian words for daughter, sister, or son, used in the first-mentioned, are synonymous with the words used in the original Pahlavi authorities.

Pahlavi is a composite language, containing the elements of two different root-languages, viz., Arian and Semitic. In it the words used to express the nearest blood relationships are generally Semitic. They are *akh* 'brother,' *akhtman* 'sister,' *benman* 'son,' and *bentman* 'daughter.' It is remarkable that in Pahlavi, as in Arabic and Hebrew, the word *akh* does not always strictly denote 'brother;' but in all these three languages it signifies 'a brother, 'a kinsman,' or 'a friend' (see Richardson and Arnold). Similarly, Pahl. *akhtman* means 'a girl,' 'a sister,' or 'a female friend.' The Pahl. *benman* denotes any intimate relation—'a boy,' 'a son,' 'a youth,' or 'a descendant. So also the Pahl. *bentman* signifies 'a girl,' 'a daughter' or 'a female kinsman.' It is, therefore, erroneous to restrict ourselves only to the meaning of 'sister' or 'daughter' whenever the Pahl. words *akhtman* or *bentman* occur.

POSITION OF ZOROASTRIAN WOMEN IN REMOTE ANTIQUITY.

Among the famous peoples of remote antiquity—be they Indo-Iranians or Indo-Europeans—there was no community in which man had more unselfish sympathy with woman than the Zoroastrian nation that lived in the Eastern territories of Iran more than three thousand years ago. Under the influence of monotheism, and by a close observation of the sublime powers of the Deity reflected in His work in Nature, the Zoroastrian man of ancient Iran had become naturally capable of appreciating the different blessings God had bestowed upon him by the creation of womankind. In primitive Iranian society the wife held a position, in social as well as spiritual relations, not inferior to her spouse, husband or lord. The wife, the mother, the daughter were beings for whom the husband, the son, the father had very anxious regard.

“When we are seeking,” says Mr. Gladstone, “to ascertain the measure of that conception which any given race has formed of our nature, there is, perhaps, no single test so effective as the position which it assigns to women. For, as the law of force is the law of the brute creation, so, in proportion as he is under the yoke of that law, does man approximate to the brute; and in proportion, on the other hand, as he has escaped from its dominion, is he ascending into the higher sphere of being, and claiming relationship with Deity.” So the probable test of the ancient Iranian civilization lies in the social and moral position which that nation assigned to its women.

Two important facts have persuaded me to select for to-day's lecture the subject of the social status of Zoroastrian women in ancient Iran. First, the general system of training imparted to Parsee girls in Bombay, which has lately been drawing to it very great attention. I trust that a treatment of the theme I have chosen, will remind us of our divergence in these days from the system of morals and spiritual culture which is so well emphasized in the ancient Zoroastrian books as the useful factor in the mental development of the female sex. Secondly, the common opinion of English writers on the history of civilization and morals, that the civilized nations of the East were, before the advent of Christianity into this world, quite unfamiliar with the highest and noblest ideas regarding woman which are embodied in the New Testament. Hence Christianity is supposed to be “the origin of many of the purest elements of our civilization.” In the “History of the Rise and Influence of the spirit of Rationalism in Europe,” by W. E. H. Lecky (Vol. I, page 213), we light upon this European or Christian standpoint: “Seldom or never has there been one which has exercised a more profound and, on the whole, a more salutary influence than the mediæval conception of the Virgin. For

the first time woman was elevated to her rightful position, and the sanctity of weakness was recognized as well as the sanctity of sorrow Into a harsh and ignorant and benighted age this ideal type infused a conception of gentleness and of purity unknown to the proudest civilizations of the past." How far Mr. Lecky's view is open to exceptions, may be easily observed by a cursory glance at the most ancient ideas regarding woman, which Zoroastrianism had taught to mankind many centuries before the Christian doctrines came into existence.¹

I have here generally confined myself to the existing fragments of the Zand-Avesta—a European designation very commonly applied to the Sacred Books of the Parsee community. The proper scientific name of the Parsee Scriptures is the *Avista*, i.e., the Revelation of what is unknown, or, according to the Vedic *Avesta*, the book containing moral and ceremonial laws. The most ancient Avesta fragments now extant, form only about one-third of the original whole, comprehended in the twenty-one Nasks of the entire Avesta literature, the rest having been scattered or destroyed during foreign conquests. Though incomplete, these existing portions have enshrined a few materials which would enable us to form an idea in outline of the training and organization of the Zoroastrian family in the golden age of the Zoroastrian people. These references have been brought to light to a certain extent by European and Parsee writers. Among the former I may mention Spiegel, Geiger, Darmesteter, Harlez, Casartelli and Zimmer; among the latter the renowned historian, Mr. Dosabhai Framjee Karaka, and Mr. Sohrabjee Shahpurjee Bengalee.² It is a happy coincidence that the liberal donor of this magnificent building³ and a pioneer of Parsee female education, Mr. Sohrabjee Bengalee, was the first to attempt, more than 30 years ago, a special discourse upon the position of Zoroastrian women in ancient Iran, in a contribution on this subject to a quarterly native journal, the *Jagat Premi*.

The time at my disposal will not permit me to submit a comparative treatment of the position of women in the Indo-Iranian period, a question

¹ Mr. Lilly says in his "Right and Wrong," p. 204: "Nowhere is the immeasurable superiority of Christianity to the rest of the world's creeds more clearly manifested than in its ideal and law of matrimony." Such opinions may be attributed to the ignorance of English philosophers of Zoroaster's ideal of women in the Parsee Scriptures, which was attained by the Zoroastrians in the more ancient Avesta period.

² As my authorities I may here mention Drs. West, Darmesteter and Mills in Max Müller's "Sacred Books of the East," Vols. IV., V., XVIII., XXIII., XXIV., XXXI.;—Spiegel (*Eranische Altertumskunde*, Vol. III; and *Arische Periode*);—Justi (*Geschichte der orientalischen Völker im Altertum*);—Geiger (*Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum*);—Schrader (*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*);—Rapp (*Die Religion und Sitte der Perser und übrigen Iranier nach den griechischen und römischen Quellen*);—Westermarck (*History of Human Marriage*);—Harlez (*Livre sacré du Zoroastrisme*);—Casartelli (*La Philosophie religieuse du Mazdeisme sous les Sassanides*); and Zimmer (*Indisches Leben*).

³ The Bai Bhikaiji Shahpurjee Bengalee Buildings of the Parsee Girls' School, Bombay.

which I hope to handle on a future occasion. My purpose has been simply to lay before you the general substance of primitive Zoroastrian thought on the training and position of women as illustrated in our most ancient writings. I have not on this occasion pointed to any of the references that are obscure or ambiguous ; my humble observations have been restricted to the authority of lucid allusions and passages.

At the outset I may be allowed to say a word regarding the literary position of the Iranian people at the time when the illustrious movement, or the Revelation in Religion, was inaugurated by *Zarathushtra Spitama*, i.e., Zoroaster. It issued as a monotheistic appeal to the free will of the different nations that then inhabited Central Asia, and had in view that noblest of all objects—progress and renovation—in the sphere of human thought concerning the power of the Highest in the Universe. Previous to that moral and spiritual movement, we ought to assume the existence of a certain kind of pre-development or preparation of ideas for its acceptance. No doubt the Iranian nation had become fully sensible in the Avesta period of the want of some powerful spiritual help, and its talents were capable of reasoning upon Zoroaster's doctrines and of discovering the truth embodied in them. Under such circumstances we can readily believe that the Zoroastrian nation, in the age of the Avesta, was composed of men and women who had already been brought up amidst civilized surroundings. The philosophical sermons addressed by Zoroaster to both the sexes, in the rhythmical style of the Gathas, furnish us with a proof of the existence of talented women in that golden age of Zoroastrian sovereignty. (Yas. XXX, 1-2 and 9).

With these preliminary remarks, I pass onward to the main part of my lecture which includes (1), the subject of birth, training and functions of the daughter of a Zoroastrian up to the age of puberty ; (2), the Avesta ideas on the marriage tie ; (3), an insight into the social and spiritual status of the Zoroastrian wife ; and (4), the question whether polygamy or monogamy was practised in the Avesta period.

The ancient Iranians had other and far higher purposes in marriages than the mere begetting of children. These purposes were not of a selfish kind. They were based or concentrated in the revealed hope of the spiritual elevation of the good creation in the end. The Zoroastrian faith aspires to a high state of spiritual progress which is to be consummated about the time of the resurrection, when the spirit of man will reach its purest or angelic stage. Humanity, according to Zoroaster, is born to fight out its struggle against evil in this world, and to adhere to and strengthen the cause of good. The principal impetus to a marriage conclusion is, consequently, the desire to contribute to the great renovation hereafter, which is promised for humanity. This renovation cannot be carried out in the individual self, but must

be gradually worked out through a continuous line of sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons. The motive of marriage for the Iranians was, therefore, sacred. It was a religious purpose which they had in view when the male and female individuals contributed by marital union (*ndirithwana*) their assistance (1), in the propagation of the human race; (2), in spreading the Zoroastrian faith; and (3), in giving stability to the religious kingdom of God by contributing to the Victory of the good cause—which victory will be complete about the time of the resurrection.¹ (Yasna LXVIII. 5; XXX. 9; XXXIV. 15; XLVI. 3; LXX. 5; Yasht XIX. 89, 98; VIII. 15; X. 38, 65; XIII. 148-155.)

The objects of the marriage bond were, therefore, purely religious, tending to the success of light, piety or virtue in this world. For this reason the old Iranian honours "the mother of many children, of many sons, of many bold talented sons." (*Vide* Visp. I. 5, etc.) The Greek historians say that a mother received from the king valuable awards for her helpful hand in the increase of the race.² "Male children," "a troop of male children," and "the purity of one's soul," are blessings of equal merit in the Avesta (Yt. VIII. 15.)³ The gift of sons is as good as the gift of a sovereignty, or of bliss in heavens. (Yt. X. 65.) Bright children and a direct line of descendants, are bestowed upon pious women by Haoma. (Yas. IX. 22.) Hence the Avesta declares that "the married man is far above him who is unmarried; he who has a settled home is far above him who has none; he who has children is far above him who has no offspring."—(Vend. IV. 47.) One of the benedictions which Zoroaster pronounced upon King Vishtâspa is: "May you (*i.e.*, King Vishtâspa and Queen Hutaosa) procreate ten male offspring resembling yourselves in their bodily constitution! May three of them follow the vocation of the priest, three the tactics of the warrior, and three agriculture! May one of them follow the ways of Jamasp (*i.e.*, turn out a sage) that you may be assisted with his most felicitous wisdom for ever and ever." (Yasht Frag. XXIV. 3.)

¹ According to Becker's *Charicles* (pp. 475 *seq.*) "There were three considerations by which the duty of marriage was enforced among the ancient Greeks: I. Respect to the gods; for it was incumbent on every one to leave behind him those who should continue to discharge his religious obligations. II. Obligation to the State; since by generating descendants, its continuance was provided for. III. A regard for their own race and lineage to discharge the duties to the departed."

² Cf. Fr. Spiegel "Nach Strabo (XV. 733) setzte der König Belohnungen für diejenigen aus, welche die meisten Söhne erzeugt hatten." (Vol. III, p. 681.)

³ Compare the *Manusmriti*, or the Institutes of the Sacred Law proclaimed by Manu (S. B. E., Vol. XXV., Chap. IX., 26-28):—"Between wives who (are destined) to bear children, who secure many blessings, who are worthy of worship and irradiate (their) dwellings, and between the goddesses of fortune, (who reside,) in the houses (of men), there is no difference whatever. The production of children, the nurture of those born, and the daily life of men, (of these matters) woman is visibly the cause. Offspring, (the due performance of), religious rites, faithful service, highest conjugal happiness and heavenly bliss for the ancestors and oneself depend on one's wife alone."

[According to Westermarck, the Hebrews have a proverb that "he who has no wife is no man." According to Manu, "marriage is the twelfth *Sanskāra*, and hence a religious duty incumbent upon all" (II. 66). "Until he finds a wife," says the Brahmadharma, "a man is only half of a whole." In ancient Greece, marriage was one of the public duties of the citizen. The old unmarried men or women, and even those that married too late were, in Sparta, prosecuted and punished (Müller, Vol. II., p. 300). According to Plato, "every individual is bound to provide for a continuance of representatives to succeed himself as ministers of the Divinity." (*Nepos* VI., p. 773.) To the Roman citizen the blessing of children was the principal motive of life. Cicero's treatise "De Legibus" states that the Roman law imposed a tax upon unmarried men. "Children," says Hobbes, "are a man's power and his honour!" (*Vide* Bain, *Morals*, p. 142.) Josephus and Zimmer record about the prehistoric Semites and the Indo-Iranians, that they were very desirous of begetting sons, specially from the religious conviction that the departed spirits of their family would be rendered happy and gratified by the ceremonial homage and remembrance offered to them in the future by their male successors. (*Vide* Westermarck, pp. 141-143 and 379.) Dr. Oldenberg (in *Buddha, seine Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*), speaks of the fundamental duties of monastic life prescribed by *Buddha*; "The monk who has sexual intercourse, is no longer a monk; he is no disciple of the son of the Sakya house." (p. 350.) Celibacy was, in Manu, enjoined on young priests and on old men; but "the *Buddha*," says Sir Monier-Williams, "enunciated that 'a wise man should avoid married life as if it were a burning pit of live coals'. . . *Buddha's* anti-matrimonial doctrines did excite opposition. The people murmured and said, 'He is come to bring childlessness amongst us, and widowhood and destruction of family life.'" (*Vide* Buddhism, p. 88.)]

According to the Avesta, married men or women who are impious, are not capable of begetting children. The good spirits imprecate childlessness upon them.—(Yas. XI. 3.) This dictum of the Avesta is in harmony with the teachings of Nature, which warn us to avoid intemperate or impious habits, as these generally deteriorate the natural powers of procreation with which the sexes are endowed. [According to Westermarck, it is a Japanese proverb that, "Honest people have many children;" the Chinese regard a large family of sons as a mark of the Divine favour; one of the chief blessings that Moses in the name of God promised the Israelites, was a numerous progeny; and the ancient Romans regarded the procreation of legitimate children as the real end of marriage."]

Among the Iranians in the age of the Avesta daughters were not disliked.¹ Although they were less useful than sons in the extension of the

¹ Comp. Ward's "Views on the Hindoos," Vol. I., page 452 :—"The Shastras declare that the daughters of Brahmans, till they are eight years old, are objects of worship.

father's race, still they, too, were objects of love and tenderness, tending to help the Zoroastrian race towards the religious object mentioned above. There is no reference in the Avesta which exhibits any trace of the displeasure of parents on the birth of a daughter. On the other hand, the name *kanya* radically points to an idea of great parental fondness for her. [According to Manu, one's daughter must be considered as 'the highest object of tenderness.' (IV. 185.)]

The Zoroastrian daughter was reared on the mother's breast to preserve the purity of her blood. She was fed on milk diet for the first two years. The preliminary instruction seems to have been given by the mother herself. No regular instruction was imparted up to the age of seven years. It has been remarked that "sin does not touch the child up to seven years of age."—(*Din.* Vol. IV., p. 263.) It was, therefore, incumbent upon the parents not to invest the daughter with the *Sudrah* and *Kusti*, before she was seven years old. About this time the daughter entered into the *airpatastân*, a religious school where she was initiated into the catechetical elements of her parental faith. The elementary religious books formed the sum-total of her school education. To make her qualified for her domestic duties, was a function that devolved almost entirely upon the mother.

When past the seventh year the boy or the girl was supposed to have become capable of distinguishing between good and evil, right and wrong. The investiture of the sacred badges after seven years, entailed upon the girl a due discharge of her common religious duties as a Zoroastrian. The Avesta as well as the Pahlavi contain indirect or distant allusions to the condition of a maiden in her father's home. General training in moral and religious precepts, the elementary rules of sanitation (Vend. VII., 60—72), the art of tending domestic animals (Yas. XXIII. 3), of spinning and weaving the sacred girdle as well as garments (Vend. V. 67 ; *charâiti*, Yt. V. 87), of superintending the labourers in the field (Yas. LXVIII. 12) and the milking of the cows (*Av. dughdhar*), formed, as it seems, the principal acquirements useful to the maiden.¹ In public as in private home-life, she enjoyed the liberty of displaying her accomplishments. She was by her home training qualified to perform

as forms of the goddess Bhagvatee ; and some persons worship these girls daily. The worshipper, taking the daughter of some neighbouring Brahman, and placing her on a seat, performs the ceremonies of worship ; in which he presents to her flowers, paint, water, garlands, incense, and, if a rich man, offerings of cloth and ornaments. He closes the whole by prostrating himself before the girl. At the worship of some of the female deities, also, the daughters of Brahmans have divine honours paid to them. The wives of Brahmans are also worshipped occasionally as an act of great merit."

¹ "Mr. Lane remarks that, in Egypt, at the age of five or six years, the children become of use to tend the flocks and herds ; and at a more advanced age, until they marry, they assist their fathers in the operations of agriculture." (Westermarck, p. 380.)

Comp. Gladstone : "The Religion of the Homeric Age," p. 512 :—"Of agricultural operations, we find women sharing only in the lighter labours of the vintage ; or perhaps

her household duties and to take part in domestic and public ceremonies ; in short, she aspired to be the delight of her husband in the future. (Vendidād III. 3.) On her mind were impressed the principal moral and religious tenets of the Avesta. She ought to be liberal, truth-speaking, God-worshipping, kind towards everyone, thankful to God, righteous, contented, obedient to her lord or husband, faithful and industrious, pious in mind, word and deed ; she ought to keep her promises, to contract no debts, to remember and revere the dear departed.

The Zoroastrian wife was capable of attaining to the best virtues acquired by pious men. " We honour the pious lady who is straightforward in her mind, speech and action, who is worthy of respect for her accomplished education (*hūshkām-sāstām*), who is obedient to her husband, who is chaste and as devoted to her guardian (*i.e.*, parents) as *Ārmaiti* and other female angels are devoted (to the Deity)." (*Vide* Gāh. IV. 9 ; S. B. E., Vol. XXXI., p. 386.)¹ " She (*i.e.*, the maiden) shall be with a mind absorbed in piety, with words all directing to piety, with deeds all conductive to piety." (Yt. XI. 4.) So the Zoroastrian girl throughout her education was trained up and qualified for all domestic requirements in her father's house, at the same time her mind was steadily cultivated in the rudimentary principles of justice, righteousness and truth, just as in modern times children receive the rudiments of grammar. In the list of personages immortalized in the pages of the Avesta, for their sanctity, wisdom, heroism or patriotism, we observe a record of illustrious maidens. The 141 st. section of the *Farvardin Yasht* perpetuate the " holy maids *Vadhūt*, *Jaghrūd*, *Franghād*, *Urūdhayant*, *Paēsanghanu*, *Hvaredhi*, *Huchithra*, *Kanuka*," and " the holy virgins *Srūtāt*fedhri, *Vanghu*-fedhri, and *Eredat*-fedhri."—(Yt. XIII. 141). We do not know any details regarding the good acts which these maidens individually achieved in a congenial sphere, but from the fact of their names having been handed down to posterity, and recited in public rituals, with those of *Zarathushtra*, *Frashaostra*, *Jamaspa*, *Maidhyōmaungha*, *Uzava*, *Husrava*, etc., we are doubtless authorized to assume that even in remote antiquity Zoroastrian maidens had exerted themselves,

acting as shepherdesses. The men plough, sow, reap, tend cattle and live-stock generally ; they hunt and they fish ; and they carry to the farm the manure that is accumulated about the house ; within doors, the women seem to have the whole duty in their hands, except the preparation of firewood and of animal food. The men kill, cut up, dress and carve the animals that are to be eaten. The women, on the other hand, spin, weave, wash the clothes, clean the house, grind the corn, bake the bread and serve it, with all the vegetable or mixed food, or what may be called made dishes."

We are told by Suetonius (Octavius, p. 64), that " the daughters and grand-daughters of Augustus were compelled to weave and spin, and that the Emperor usually wore no other garments but those made by the hands of his wife and sister." (Letourneau, p. 199.)

¹ Cf. Manu, IX. 29 :—" She who, controlling her thoughts, speech and acts, violates not her duty towards her lord, dwells with him (after death) in heaven, and in this world is called by the virtuous a faithful wife."

with success, in rendering their names immortal in this life, and their spirits happy in the next world.¹

Hence Dr. Geiger says, "It would not be easy to find a people that attained, under equal or similar historical conditions, to such a height of ethical knowledge." (*Vide* my Translation, *Supra*. p. 219.)—Hence Dr. Rapp is able to make the following observations: "The importance and value of this education appear, however, most clear by the cultivation of such qualities as magnanimity, the love of truth, justice and courage, whereby the Persian people have deservedly earned for themselves the name of a noble race. . . . The insight into the moral life was here evidently coupled with the cultivation of the religious belief professed by the Persians, which helped the development of morals through the fostering of virtues, and which system of education

¹ The following description of the chivalrous feats of an Iranian maiden, in pre-Zoroastrian time, will be of some interest. *Vide* Zimmern, *Firdausi*, pp. 138-141.

"Now the guardian of the White Castle, the fortress wherein Iran put its trust, was named Hujir, and there lived with him Gustahom the Brave, but he was grown old and could aid no longer save with his counsels. And there abode also his daughter Gurdafriid, a warlike maid, firm in the saddle and practised in the fight. . . .

"But when those within the castle learned that their chief was bound, they raised great lamentation, and their fears were sore. And Gurdafriid, too, when she learned it, was grieved, but she was ashamed also for the fate of Hujir. So she took forth burnished mail and clad herself therein, and she hid her tresses under a helmet of Rourm, and she mounted a steed of battle and came forth before the walls like to a warrior. And she uttered a cry of thunder, and flung it amid the ranks of Turan, and she defied the champions to come forth to single combat. And none came, for they beheld her how she was strong; and they knew not that it was a woman, and they were afraid. But Sohrab, when he saw it, stepped forth and said—

" 'I will accept thy challenge, and a second prize will fall into my hands.' (Because Sohrab had already defeated Hujir, and sent him captive unto Human.)

"Then he girded himself and made ready for the fight. And the maid, when she saw he was ready, rained arrows upon him with art, and they fell quick like hail, and whizzed, about his head; and Sohrab, when he saw it, could not defend himself, and was angry and ashamed. Then he covered his head with his shield and ran at the maid. But she, when she saw him approach, dropped her bow and couched a lance, and thrust at Sohrab with vigour, and shook him mightily, and it wanted little, and she would have thrown him from his seat. And Sohrab was amazed, and his wrath knew no bounds. Then he ran at Gurdafriid with fury, and seized the reins of her steed, and caught her by the waist, and tore her armour, and throw her upon the ground. Yet ere he could raise his hand to strike her, she drew her sword and shivered his lance in twain, and leaped again upon her steed. And when she saw that the day was hers, she was weary of further combat, and she sped back unto the fortress. But Sohrab gave rein unto his horse, and followed after her in his great anger. And he caught her, and seized her, and tore the helmet from off her head, for he desired to look upon the face of the man who could withstand the son of Rustam. And lo! when he had done so, there rolled forth from the helmet coils of dusky hue, and Sohrab beheld it was a woman that had overcome him in the fight. And he was confounded. But when he had found speech he said—

" 'If the daughters of Iran are like to thee, and go forth into battle, none can stand against this land.' "

served to mould the essential character of the individual man." (*Vide* Mr. K. R. Kama's translation of Dr. Rapp's German work.)¹

Before her marriage the maiden was under the guardianship of the *pater-familias*, the grandfather or the father, the natural brother or the adopted son of the father. In her daily prayers she frequently implores that she may have a husband, and attain to fidelity in the Zoroastrian teachings :—"Grant us this blessing . . . that we may obtain a husband, young and of a beautiful person, who will ever offer us good gifts, who will live long and beget us offspring ; a goodnatured, learned and eloquent husband." (Yt. XV. 40 ; cf. S. B. E. Vol. XXIII., p. 258.) "Unhappy is the handsome maiden who has remained childless and wants a good husband."—(Vend. III. 24.)

The ancient Iranian ideal of female beauty consisted in white complexion, a tall symmetrical body, thin waist, sharp eyes, and small slender fingers. "Then approaches the handsome, physically strong and tall maiden." (Vend. XIX. 30 ; cf. S. B. E., Vol. IV., p. 213.) The *Hadókht Nask* delineates "a beautiful maiden, brilliant, white-armed, strong, well grown, high statured, tall, with prominent breasts, straight, noble, with a dazzling face, of fifteen years."—(Cf. Haug, Chap. II. 22, p. 311.) The female genius Ardivi wore "square golden ear-rings, a golden necklace around her beautiful neck, and girded her waist tightly." (Yt. V. 127 ; *vide* S. B. E., Vol. XXIII., p. 83.)²

The fifteenth year was the normal age of puberty of the male as well as of the female. (Ys. IX. 5 ; Vend. XIV. 15 ; XVIII. 54.) At this age the parents or guardians of the maiden would endeavour to find a suitable match for her.³ As the Avesta community was made up of four distinct professions—the priest, the warrior, the agriculturist and the artisan (?), who held

¹Rev. J. Van den Gheyn remarks, "The Mazdian religion can boast of having the soundest, the sublimest, and the most rational system of morals among all the non-Christian religions. The basis of these morals rests on the free volition of man." (*Essais*, p. 231.)—*Vide* the same idea in Dr. Casartellie's French, p. 137, wherein the writer avers :—"La religion mazdéenne peut se vanter avec raison, parmi toutes les religions non-chrétiennes, d'avoir la moral la plus saine, la plus haute et la plus raisonnable."

²Here it is interesting to notice parallel ideas regarding female beauty in an Indian book, the Sanskrit *Dasakumāracharitam*, by Dandin, which is believed to have been written about the end of the 11th century, A.D. The *Adventures of Mitrugupta* records an ideal of beauty in pages 186-187, of Mr. Parah's edition, whereof I give the purport below :—

"This is just the wife to suit me ; she is neither too tall nor too short, too stout or too thin ; her limbs are rounded and well-knit ; her back is straight ; with a slight hollow ; her shoulders are low ; her arms plump and soft ; the lines of her hands indicate good fortune ; her fingers are long and slender ; her nails are like polished gems ; her neck is smooth and rounded as a slender shell ; her bosom full and well-shaped ; her face has a sweet expression ; her lips are full and red ; her chin small and compact ; her cheeks plump ; her eyebrow glossy black, gracefully curved, meeting in the middle ; her eyes are long and languishing, very black and very white ; her forehead, adorned by beautiful curls, resembles a piece of the moon ; her ears are delicately formed, and well set off by the ear-rings ; her hair is glossy black, brown at the ends—long, thick, and not too much curled." (*Vide* Jacob, pp. 268 *seq.*)

³ According to Letourneau, "Marriages of children, especially of little girls, were the rule at Rome, since the nuptial majority of the girls was fixed at twelve years. But

each his own respective rank, the parents or their representatives would naturally think of finding out a son-in-law from their own profession, or from one that was superior to their own, or one of a better lineage. The marrying maiden was, no doubt, very careful in selecting her husband, but she had sometimes to rely upon the judgment of her parents. Her choice was subject to confirmation by the latter. In very rare cases where the maiden had no proper guardian, she made a choice for herself.¹

The solicitations for the hand of a maiden were made through a wise and experienced friend, who served as an intermediary for bringing in the details regarding her genealogy, condition, and qualifications. It is to be observed that the ancient Iranian marriage tie was not the result of any capture or purchase, but of pure selection on the part of the marrying individual, male or female, subject to the confirmation of his or her parents or guardians. It is sufficiently clear that the maiden's choice did not fall upon riches or a man of money, but rather on a man of good lineage, of a good character, physically strong, talented, eloquent and religious.² As for the bachelor, the remarkable sayings of the *Mînô-i-Kherad* are as follows:—"Choose as your wife a woman, who possesses the accomplishments (*pyan gôhar*) befitting her, because that one is a blessing who is very much respected (in the community)." —(Chap. II. 30.) "A virtuous wife of a good behaviour aggrandizes conjugal happiness."—(XIV. 12.) "That wife is the worst with whom there is no

they were often betrothed and even married before that age. Vipsania Agrippina, daughter of Agrippa and of Pomponia, was promised to Tiberius from her first year. The *Digest* authorized betrothal at the age of seven. In betrothing his daughter the father contracted a civil obligation, sanctioned at first by an action for damages, and later by infamy." (*Evolution of Marriage*, p. 198.)—"The young Greek girl could not dispose of her person any more than the Chinese or Hindoo woman could. She was married by her father." (p. 195.)

¹ In Manu, S. B. E., Vol. XXV., Chap. IX. 2-4: "Day and night women must be kept in dependence by the males (of) their (families), and, if they attach themselves to sensual enjoyments, they must be kept under one's control. Her father protects (her) in childhood, her husband protects (her) in youth, and her son protects (her) in old age; a woman is never fit for independence. Reprehensible is the father who gives not his daughter in marriage at the proper time; reprehensible is the husband who approaches not (his wife in due season), and reprehensible is the son who does not protect his mother after her husband has died."—(IX. 88-92.) "To a distinguished, handsome suitor (of equal (caste) should (a father) give his daughter in accordance with the prescribed rule, though she has not attained (the proper age). But the maiden, though marriageable, should rather stop in the father's house until death, than that he should ever give her to a man destitute of good qualities. Three years let a damsel wait, though she be marriageable, but after that time let her choose for herself a bridegroom of equal caste and rank. If being not given in marriage, she herself seeks a husband, she incurs no guilt, nor does he whom she weds. A maiden who chooses for herself, shall not take with her any ornaments, given by her father or her mother or her brothers; if she carries them away, it will be theft."

² Manu, IX. 14:—"Women do not care for beauty, nor is their attention fixed on age; (thinking) 'it is enough that he is a man,' they give themselves to the handsome and to the ugly."

possible enjoyment in this life.”—(XXXIII. 14.) The sayings of Atrôpâta dictate to his son: “Love always a prudent and modest woman, and be married to such a one alone. Let your son-in-law be a man good-natured, healthy and well-experienced in his profession, never mind though he be poor.”—(Cf. Dastur Peshotânji’s edition.) From Vendidad II. we might assume a prohibition against marrying a lunatic, an indigent and an impotent person, an infidel or a leprous individual.

In the 14th chapter of the Vendidad, we meet with the following passage which alludes to marriage as a means of atonement :--

“As an expiation he (*i.e.*, a Zoroastrian) shall, with sincerity and pious feeling, give in marriage to a pious male (*i.e.*, a priest) a virgin, who has loved no man. . . ., a sister or a daughter, at the age of puberty, with ear-rings in her ears and past her fifteenth year.”—(Cf. S. B. E., Vol. IV., p. 171.)¹ Though this commandment leads us to assume the existence of a belief that even it was a means of expiation, or a meritorious act, to persuade a pious virgin to marry a pious priest; yet such marriage ties must have been formed rarely in a community where the exercise of free will (Ys. XXX. 1-2) was the principal factor under a Zoroastrian administration.

The latest scientific research which has opened the secret mines of the Gâthic or the most ancient Zoroastrian lore, enables us to prove the existence of a highly pure idea of an Iranian marriage. Dr. Geiger, in his German work *Ostiranische Kultur*, makes the following observation (p. 242) :—

“Contrasted with the foregoing (*i.e.*, Vend. XIV. 15), a stanza in the Gāthās, if rightly interpreted, appears to contain a higher and purer idea of marriage, and to regard it as an intimate union founded on love and piety. On the occasion of the celebration of a marriage, the priestly singer addresses, as I would believe, the young people with these words :—

(LIII. 5.)

[illegible]

¹ Ward remarks that so great a disgrace is incurred by remaining unmarried that on one occasion a number of old Hindoo maids were married to an old *kulina* Brahman, as his friends were carrying him to the Ganges to die (*vide* Vol. III., p. 181).

“ Admonishing words I say unto the maidens, who will enter into marriage,

“ And to you (the youth) I, who know it. Take them to heart ;

“Learn to know through religion and of these (the parents), the life of a good mind ;

“ In piety you shall both seek to win the love of each other, only thus will it lead you to joy ! ”

The latest translation of these Avesta verses given by Dr. L. H. Mills in the 31st vol. of Max Müller's Sacred Books of the East, runs in the following manner :—

“ Monitions for the marrying I speak to (you) maidens, to you, I who know them ; and heed ye my (sayings) : By these laws of the Faith which I utter, obtain ye the life of the Good Mind (on earth and in heaven). (And to you, bride and bridegroom), let each one the other in Righteousness cherish ; thus alone unto each shall the home-life be happy.”

The latter version is more in conformity with the Pahlavi, and will be more intelligible if we refer to the previous verse in the same Gâthâ.

(LIII. 3-4.)

[illegible]

“ And him ” (*i.e.*, the bridegroom, Jāmāspa) “ will they give thee, O Pouruchista, Haëchataspid and Spitāmi ! Young (as thou art) of the daughters of Zarathustra, him will he (*i.e.*, the bride’s father) give thee as a help

in the Good Mind's true service, of Asha's and Mazda's, as a protector and a guardian. Counsel well then (together), with the mind of Ârmaiti, most bounteous and pious; and act with just action." (The bride *Pouruchista* answers:) "I will love and vie with him (i.e., the bridegroom), since from (my) father he gained (me.)" (*Vide* Vol. XXXI. 191-192.)

These remarkable verses (3-5) of the 53rd Chapter of the Yasna or of the Gâthâ *Vahishtôishti* form a surviving remnant of the oldest marriage formulæ that were addressed, by the greatest of Iranian priests and poets, Zarathushtra Spitama, to the bride and the bridegroom, on the occasion of the marriage ceremony of his youngest daughter *Pouruchishta* ("full of wisdom") with the Iranian philosopher Jâmâspa.¹ These stanzas inculcate to us the oldest Iranian doctrine regarding the noble ends of a pious wedlock. The bridegroom, as it seems, is given over to the bride to help her in the conscientious service of Piety, Righteousness (*Asha*), and Communion with the Deity. It is the duty of the two to love one another, with the mind of devotion (*Ârmaiti*), with chastity and truth. The marital love was doubly strengthened by the lover's choice having been confirmed by their parents or guardians, so *Pouruchishta* the bride answers: "I will (now) love and vie with him (in love)." The fifth stanza impresses upon the minds of the assembly that it is the religious sentiment of devotion to the Deity which leads us to the path of love. Mutual connubial love is bred by a sincere devotion of the husband towards the wife, and conveys them to the enjoyment of the pure joys of a happy home.

These moral ideas relating to wedlock are also implied in the verbs *vadh*, *vaz* and *vah*, which commonly denote in Indo-Iranian dialects "to marry," "to have connubial relations." These verbs radically mean "to lead," "to convey." We do not know the nature of the ceremony by which the bride was led to the house of the bridegroom in the Avesta period, but it is interesting to find in the 85th *Sûkta* of the tenth *Mandala* of the Rig-Veda, a figurative description of how the bride *Suryâ* was led to her husband's home. Therein we are told that it was in the chariot of the mind that *Suryâ* was driven, the bullocks yoked to it were the sun and the moon (i.e., light or piety,) and the wheels were her ears.² Hence we might draw a parallel between the marital conception of the Vedic Indians and that of the Avestic Iranians. It was an instinct of pious love which drove the heart of a maiden to find her complement in the male sex and enter into the sacred bonds of marriage.³ (*Comp.* Schrader, *Sprach vergleichung*, Chap. on "Marriage.")

¹ See my lectures on the "Alleged Practice of Next-of-Kin Marriages in old Iran," delivered, in April 1887, before the B. B. Royal Asiatic Society, in the Society's Journal, No. XLVI., p. 134.

² In Becker's *Charicles* we find that the Grecian bride was "fetched away towards evening by the bridegroom in a carriage drawn by mules or oxen, and probably by horses." (p. 485.)

³ We find interesting details of the Roman ceremony of conducting the bride to the home of the bridegroom in Prof. Becker's *Gallus* or Roman Scenes of the Time of Augustus.

I now proceed to the social position of the wife among the primitive Zoroastrians. The common Avesta words which mean the wife are *ghend*, *nāiri* and *nmānō-pathni*. The first word means, etymologically, "a begetter of children," "a bearer," or "a mother." The second is a simple feminine form of the word *nērē*, "a male," "a man," "a hero." The third literally denotes 'the lady or mistress of the house' as the husband is generally called in the Avesta 'the lord or master of the house.' (Yt. V. 87; XV. 40.) Herein lies a linguistic proof for the assumption that in the Avesta period the position of the Iranian wife was one of equality to that of her husband. A second argument may be alleged from the existence of the expression *piθē* for the wedded pair in Yt. X. 84 (comp. Ost. Kultur, p. 245; Spiegel's *Commentar*, Vol. II., pp. 566-567; C. de Harlez, *Av. tr.*, p. 236), which enables us to presume that the rights and interests of the husband and the wife were identical, and that the latter did not stand in the relation of a slave or a mere "bearer of children" to the former. In Yasna LXVIII. 12, the husband and the wife together pray to God and implore for help. Before submitting more important points concerning the high position the Zoroastrian wife enjoyed in ancient Iran, I would draw your attention to what foreign European writers have said on the authority of the earliest literature now extant. The latest German work that speaks upon it is the *Ostiranische Kultur im Alterthum*, from which I translate the following passages:—

"It is characteristic, as bearing upon the legal and the moral position of the wife in the old Iranian house, that she bears from the marriage-day the title of *nmānō-pathni*, 'the mistress of the house,' just as the husband is called *nmānō-paīti*, 'the master of the house.' The wife ranks thus more as the equal of the husband than his dependent. She is not his slave but his com-

This writer observes that the ceremonious fetching of the bride from her parental house to that of the bridegroom, called *deductio*, took place in all kinds of marriages. This ceremony regularly occurred in the evening, under the protection of Juno Domiduca by torchlight and accompanied by relations and friends, amongst whom were women who conducted the bride to the *thalamus nuptialis*, and who were permitted to have been only once married. The bride having arrived at the house of the bridegroom festively adorned to receive her, ornamented the doorposts with *lanæ vittæ* and annointed them with *oleum*. Equally general was the custom of carrying the bride over the threshold in order to avoid the bad omen of stumbling with her foot on it. First, the bride saluted the bridegroom; the latter replied to this address of the former in an equally measured symbolical form. The bridegroom received the bride with water and fire, and presented these two elements to her touch. Next followed the religious solemnities under the direction of the Pontifex Maximus and the Flamen Dialis, in the presence of ten witnesses. The auspices were also taken. The joint-eating of bread by the newly married was necessary; also the joining together of hands by the priest. The newly married couple sat for a time on two chairs standing near to each other and covered by the same sheep-skin, signifying that, although the man and the woman occupied two different parts of the house, that they were nevertheless firmly bound by one common bond. At the celebration of the wedding a contract of marriage concerning the *dos* was entered into and sealed by those present as witnesses (see pp. 160 seq.).

panion, entitled to all his privileges, sharing with him the direction and management of the household.

"In the Avesta both sexes appear constantly as possessing equal rights ; there is no difference as to their respective importance. Pious men and women are frequently named together. As in this world, so also in the next, they live together, enjoying in common the pleasures of Paradise. Wives are an honour to the house, and the good spirits, particularly Ahura Mazda, are represented as being in the company of female *Yazatas*.

"As in the Vedic antiquity, so also amongst the Avesta people, women took part even in the holy ceremonies and solemn offerings.¹ The ladies of the house who cherish good thoughts, utter good words, and perform good actions, who are obedient and subject to their lords, are invited in the Vispered at the offering ceremony equally with pious and orthodox men. Further on it is said that both wife and husband naturally pray together, with uplifted hands, to Mithra for his protection and support. The following remarkable saying of the Rig-Veda is also in accordance with Iranian custom : 'Already from olden time the wife has attended the common sacrificial offerings and festive gatherings, she, the fosterer of the holy law.'

This opinion, which is shared in by almost all Iranists, may be further confirmed by references to the Avesta statements that the Zoroastrian wife is capable of vieing with her husband in acquiring moral and spiritual virtues, and is a co-operator with him in helping forward the progress of humanity by ardent efforts to suppress evil of every kind in this world.—(Yt. XIII. 154.) Wherever the Avesta alludes to pious males, it does not omit to make mention of females of like character. It speaks of a pious co-operation of the husband and the wife in the propitiation of God (Yasna. I., 16 ; XIV. 7, etc.), of just men and just women (Ys. VIII. 3. ; XVI. 9 ; LXXI. 10), of male and female saints. (Ys. V. 27 ; II., LVIII. 5.) The sixteenth Yasht records the earnest prayer of a Zoroastrian wife that she may not swerve for a moment from the Law of God. This represents to us that in her heart the lady sincerely wishes that she would be able to discharge her moral and religious duties amidst the material associations of this world. In the same section we are told that she worshipped "endowed with full knowledge" (*vithushi vohu-banghem*) of the ceremony. Again in Yasht XV. 36, the materfamilias seems to wish that her respect in the family would remain intact ; that she would be loved, and respected by her husband, and become praiseworthy amongst her relations, (Cf., S. B. E., Vol. XXIII., p. 257).

Above all, we observe the poet Zoroaster praying in a rhythmical strain to the God Ahura Mazda, that the virtuous and noble Hutaosa, the wife of

¹ Cf. Manu, IX. 96 :—"To be mothers were women created and to be fathers men ; religious rites, therefore, are ordained in the Veda to be performed by the husband together with the wife."

King Vishtâspa, may exert herself to assist him in propagating amongst her sex the moral and spiritual culture of which he was the great pioneer and teacher.—(Yt. IX. 26 ; XVII. 46.)¹ In the thirteenth Yasht we meet with a sacred enumeration of wives and husbands whose names are immortalized for their spontaneous efforts in saving humanity from moral and physical depravity. *Hvôvi*, *Frêni*, *Thriti*, *Pouruchista*, *Hulaosa*, *Huma*, *Zairichi*, *Vispataurvashi*, *Ushtavaiti*, *Tushnâmiti*, *Frêni* the wife of *Usenemah*, *Frêni* the daughter-in-law of *Frâyazanta*, *Frêni* the daughter-in-law of *Khshôiwâspa*, *Frêni* the wife of *Gayadhâsti*, *Asabani*, the wife of *Pourudhâkhshli*, and *Ukhshyeinti*, the wife of *Stuotar-Vahishtahê-Ashyêhê* (139-140), are the illustrious names that remind us of the golden age of Iranian history when women served with a pious motive as preachers, warriors and patriots of their country. In §§ 148, 149, and 154 the spirits of those women are invoked who had fought all their lives for the good of mankind, for the good cause of that spiritual progress which Zoroastrianism aims at. In a later Pahlavi treatise we find the nine daughters of Spitama receiving precious rewards from Iranian rulers as a recognition of their help in the spiritual advancement of their nation.

In the scanty fragments of the oldest Iranian literature we do not find a detailed picture of a famous woman ; but we can easily trace her work from the virtues and qualities for which righteous women have been so frequently extolled.

The duties of a woman in the Avesta period were, therefore, not simply confined to the economical functions of her household, but they had an important bearing upon the moral and spiritual progress of the Avesta nation. Her training had rendered her capable of serving not only as a moral teacher to her own children, but also to her own sex. What should we assume to be the result of the enjoyment of such a position by the Zoroastrian mother, wife, or daughter, more than three thousand years ago ?

Regarding the question whether polygamy or monogamy prevailed in Iran in the Avesta period, there is no direct passage which favours the one or the other. From some indirect references Prof. C. de Harlez briefly remarks: "La polygamie ne semble pas y avoir été admise"² (*vide* p. 172) ; while Dr. Geiger says : "Leider fehlt es im Avesta wieder an positiven zeugnissen sowohl nach der einen als auch nach der anderen seite hin, und wir müssen uns demnach fast nur mit indirekten beweisen und analogieschlüssen behelfen. Söhne und frauen gelten als schmuck eines hauses und die götter schenken

¹ Hence Prof. Darmesteter remarks that "the moral victory of Zoroastrianism is the work of a woman, and that no picture of woman is nobler and higher than that which is drawn in the Avesta."

² Relying upon the authority of de Harlez, the French translator of the Avesta, Ch. Letourneau says in his "Evolution of Marriage," London, 1891 (p. 150) :—"The polygamy of the monarchs of ancient Persia seems to have been copied from that of the kings of Egypt, or of the Incas of Peru. As for the Persians of more ancient times still

sie dem frommen in fülle. Hierin könnte man eine andeutung sehen, nach welcher poligamie üblich gewesen und eine grosse anzahl von frauen als zeichen der wohlhabenheit und des himmlischen segens betrachtet worden wäre.'— "Unfortunately there is a lack of positive testimony as much concerning the one as concerning the other, and we must, therefore, content ourselves with merely indirect proofs and conclusions drawn from analogy. Sons and wives are esteemed as an ornament to a house and the *yazatas* bestow them upon the pious in abundance. This might be construed as an indication that polygamy was customary, and a great number of women a mark of opulence and Divine blessing."—(V. p. 68 of my Translation, Vol. I.) My remark on this conclusion is that it is now as inadmissible as the rendering "abundance of women" (in Dr. Spiegel's German Translation of the Avesta) for the expression *frapithwo nâirika*, is inadmissible. The second word is the nominative singular feminine and refers to a single woman or the mistress of the house. The whole expression would rather mean "(where) the wife is well nourished or happy." Even if we were to regard the expression as meaning "many women or wives," still it would not imply the wives of a single man, but a number of married women living in the same house. Here I have to repeat what I have already stated in my note on page 68 of my English Translation:—Just as is the case in Parsee families in India, so also in the age of the Avesta we may conceive a Zoroastrian family as having married daughters, daughters-in-law, and even grand-daughters-in-law with the materfamilias at their head, all forming a group of more than a dozen women.—Even the very nature of the marriage ideas which are inculcated in the Gâthâs, and which I have just mentioned, does not authorize us to assume any trace of polygamy among nations that flourished amidst very civilized surroundings.¹

It is possible that in later times associations with foreign nations, Mahomedans or Hindoos, might have introduced the practice of polygamy into the Zoroastrian community, but, so far as the Avesta period is concerned, there has been no mention of two wives belonging to one man nor any allusion even far-fetched to that practice.²

the Mazdians who drew up the Sacred code of the Avesta, if we refer to the Zend text, we find they had a most severe sexual morality. The Avestic code condemns and punishes resort to prostitutes, seduction, sexual extravagances, abortion, etc. Throughout that portion of the Avesta, which has come down to us, there is no recognition of polygamy and the verses which mention marriage have quite a monogamic meaning."

¹ "Where women have succeeded in obtaining some power over their husbands, or where the altruistic feelings of men have become refined enough to lead them to respect the feelings of those weaker than themselves, monogamy is generally considered the only proper form of marriage." (Wester., p. 500.)

² From the works of Greek writers Dr. Friedrich Spiegel makes the following deductions in the 3rd vol. of his German work, *Iranische Alterthumskunde*, p. 377 seq.—In the time of Herodotus, Persians practised polygamy (Her. I. 135), and according to Strabo, the Median kings married many wives, and the Medians dwelling in the mountainous districts had no less than five wives (XI. 526). Polyandry was also not rare among them. Polygamy of the Iranians is supported by Ammianus, Agathias and the *Shahnamah*.

Illegal union between the sexes was condemned as a mortal crime.—(Vend. XVIII. 62-65.)¹ A bad woman was unfit to offer any prayer.—(Yt. XVII. 54.) “Stand thou not near her, sit thou not by her side,” is the exhortation to woman in Sec. 57 of the 17th Yasht. Infanticide was strictly prohibited.—(Vend. XV. 11-14; Yt. XXV. 29.) The destruction of the fruit of adultery in the womb, by means of drugs, was regarded as wilful murder, and was by law punishable as such. The sinful woman, her paramour and the procurer of drugs, were supposed to be equally guilty of killing the child. The illegitimate offspring ought to be fed and brought up at the expense of the male sinner, until it becomes seven years of age.—(Vend. XV. 45.) A sorceress is an accursed creature. Disobedience towards the husband is a shameful crime. Failure to preserve one’s health in a lying-in state is also a sin.—(Vend. VII., &c.) A later Pahlavi book calls it a sin liable to hellish punishment if a mother fails to suckle her baby or to feed it on her pure milk, or if she steals the property of her husband or disobeys her sovereign.² It is disgraceful if the husband fails to instruct his wife, and does not keep her away from doing evil acts (*Vîrâf*, Chaps. 87, 63, 99, 68).

My subject has now come to an end. The successful results of the system of training imparted to the Zoroastrian wife and of her high position and work in the ancient Iranian community, may be easily marked in the moral growth and physical welfare of the nation under the sovereignty of the Zoroastrian monarch Vishtâspa (Gushtasp). “Let France have good mothers and she will have good sons,” was a happy remark of the Emperor Napoleon. The literary attainments of the mother, her fitness to perform her household duties, her example of a moral and religious life, are more beneficial to posterity, to the future progress of a nation, than the impressions produced by the father. Moral and religious instruction ought, therefore, to form the chief element in the education of women of every country; for without religion there is no moral obligation, and without the sense of a moral obligation, no sympathy or unity with the family, race, or community.

I beg to submit a few remarks which have been suggested to me by this humble attempt at discoursing upon the position of Zoroastrian women in remote antiquity. The first refers to the question: “Why did the lecturer omit to throw some light upon the alleged practice of next-of-kin marriages in ancient Iran, which had been emphasized by several European writers as the darkest shade in the picture of women drawn in the Avesta?” My answer to this is that the *pros* and *cons* regarding the alleged practice of consanguineous marriages among the Iranians of remote antiquity have been

¹ “Thou shouldst abstain from the wives of others,” admonishes the *Minô-i-Kherad*, “otherwise you will consume three things: the wealth, the body, and the soul at once.”

² Manu, IX. 13:—“Drinking spirituous liquor, associating with wicked people, separation from the husband, rambling abroad, sleeping at unseasonable hours, and dwelling in other men’s houses, are the six causes of the ruin of women.”

fully discussed by me in my papers on this subject, which I had the honour to read before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in April 1887, under the presidency of the honourable chairman. The European standpoint rests upon a meaning of the Avesta word *Hvaetvadatha*, which, as has been shown by me, does not indicate "next-of-kin marriages," but "the spiritual communion of the husband and the wife with the Deity." It is a pleasure to notice scholars like Hubschmann, Geiger and Justi conceding that the Avesta contains no allusions to the alleged next-of-kin marriages among the ancient Iranians.

The second point I may be allowed to touch upon, is the absence of the brilliant ideas of marriage I have just quoted from the Gathas, in the marriage-formulæ recited in India. The present formulæ embody a double benediction in two different languages, viz., Pazand and Sanskrit, including, about the end, three short citations from the Avesta *Yasna*, Chaps. LIX. 30-31, LIV. 1* and LXVIII. 11 I humbly submit that a lucid and rhythmical Gujerati version of the original Pazand be substituted for the present incorrect and often unmeaning Sanskrit translation that is recited during the marriage-ceremony. It is highly desirable that some necessary insertions be made into the present formulæ of apt passages in the Gathas LIII. 2-5 that interpret very noble ideas regarding matrimony, and the mutual duties of the husband and the wife.

From the authority of the Avesta we learn that in the remotest Zoroastrian period the names of illustrious maidens, as well as of philanthropic women, were recorded or immortalized with those of eminent men. But since the Zoroastrian immigration into India, no such honour has been accorded to the Parsee ladies, who had, to a great extent, fulfilled the noble object of sympathizing with the difficulties of their co-religionists, and of helping forward their physical, educational and religious progress. We ought to hand down to posterity our respectful remembrance of the noblest deeds of Lady Avانبai Jamshedjee Jeejeebhai, and the charitable acts of Bai Mithibai Hormusji Wadia,† and Lady Sakarbai Dinshahjee Petit. Such a record of noble women will, I trust, tend to encourage female charity, and be conducive to the good of the suffering humanity.

* Under the present circumstances a revision of the Pazand text is, of course, indispensable, for there is no meaning whatever in putting a question to the following effect, to the witness representing the party of the bridegroom:—"Have you promised to pay to the bride two thousand *dirhams* of pure white silver, 'and two *dinars* of bright gold of the city of *Nishdhpur*," when no such coins have ever been, or are current, in India. Every such witness confirming, as he does, this absurd promise in his evidence, becomes, from a legal stand-point, guilty of unconscious *mithrô-druja* (perjury).

† One of the eminent founders of the Hormusjee Wadia Atash-Behram at Bombay.

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL LIBRARY

Title *The Collected Works of*
Sanjana, D.D.P.

Class No. *295*

Book No. *S 227e*

Date of Issue	Issued to	Date of Return

Library of the
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL
Call No.....
Accession No.....
Shelf No.....